

MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION
(IRELAND).

PART I.

EVIDENCE,

WITH
APPENDICES.

DUBLIN, RATHMINES, PEMBROKE, KILMAINHAM, DRUMCONDRA,
CLONTARF, AND ALSO KINGSTOWN, BLACKROCK, AND DALKEY.

Presented to both Houses of Parliament by Command of Her Majesty



DUBLIN :

PRINTED BY ALEX. THOM & CO., 87, 88, & 89, ABBEY-STREET,
THE QUEEN'S PRINTING OFFICE
FOR HER MAJESTY'S STATIONERY OFFICE.

1881.

[C.—2725.] Price 3s. 6d.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

EXAMINED AT THE DUBLIN INQUIRY.

	Page		Page
Andrews, W. D., q.c., case for Pembroke,	174	Jackson, J.,	210
Baker, H.,	267	Jacob, William,	171
Balfour, J.,	235	Johnston, H.,	145, 290
Barnwell, R.,	226		
Beveridge, J.,	3, 49, 87, 271	Kelagh, Mr.,	199
Bentley, M. C.,	155, 156, 157, 162, 167	Killen, J. B., case for Clontarf,	200
Boyle, J., c.c.,	68, 271	Lombard, J. F.,	196
Bolton, S. H.,	123		
Bradley, W. D.,	266	McBirney, D.,	219
Bradley, W. G.,	214, 264	McDonnell, Alexander,	230
Browne, H. E.,	216	McEvoy, J.,	90
Browne, Dr. E.,	141	Magee, James,	163
Brett, H., c.c.,	152, 239	Mallin, W. H.,	142
Brooke, Stewart,	269	McCarthy, S. E.,	197
Butler, F.,	173	McMahon, E.,	198
Byrne, J. P.,	51, 100	Mayne, Thomas,	169
Byrne, John,	109	Menke, Michael,	188
Caldwood, H. G.,	271	Moyers, George,	188
Cameron, Dr. G.,	53	Moyes, E. H.,	204
Carry, John,	208	Murphy, Michael,	135
Cohorn, R. G.,	228	Mills, Rev. Thomas,	227
Curtin, John,	49, 273	Neville, Parkes, c.c.,	92
Dawson, Charles,	59	O'Donnell, Thomas,	28, 35, 39, 51
Delany, George,	85	Patterson, B. T.,	149
Donnelly, James,	296, 310	Pattin, M.,	137
Eason, Charles,	137	Pattin, J. T.,	40
Erington, S. L.,	164	Robinson, A. H.,	184, 211
Evans, J. H.,	111, 120, 149, 156, 162, 166, 253	Robinson, W. J.,	269
Fotrell, R.,	154	Saunders, John,	372
French, Thomas,	172	Shannon, G. W.,	170
Gamble, Michael,	207	Sharidan, Peter,	273
Griffin, S.,	164	Shire, Rev. L. T.,	211
Gregg, J. W., Alderman,	88	Scott, F. M.,	223
Gray, E. D., n.c.,	78	Stewart, J. R.,	266
Gray, E. A.,	241	Stokes, F.,	245, 265, 269
Hamilton, Dr. E.,	168	Studdert, Lawrence,	169
Hanlon, C. H.,	165	Suemers, John,	225
Harricks, J. T.,	144	Tokell, George,	237
Harris, Alderman,	72	Vernon, J. E.,	178
Hassard, R., c.c.,	121	Vernon, J. E. V.,	260, 292
Henshaw, A.,	163	Walker, S., q.c., case for Drumcondra,	103
Heron, D. C., statement for Corporation,	1	Wright, Dr. E. P.,	188
Hogan, John,	189	Wright, Frederick,	292
Hydes, B. N.,	204		
Ingram, J. R.,	36		

EXAMINED AT RATHMINES, PEMBROKE, KILMAINHAM, DRUMCONDRA, CLONTARF, AND ALSO AT KINGSTOWN, BLACKROCK, AND DALKEY.

	Page		Page
Rathmines.		Kingstown.	
Evans, J. H.,	275	Ennis, R. J.,	283
Parker, A., c.c.,	276	Barnes, Mr.,	292
Lausombe, T. G.,	276		
Bewley, S.,	277	Blackrock.	
Pembroke:		Porter, P. M.,	293
Robinson, A. H.,	278	Wigham, J. R.,	294
Kilmainham:			
Hamilton, H.,	279		
Drumcondra:			
Pattin, M.,	280	Parkinson, H. A.,	297, 301, 302, 305
Clothes:		Conlon, Rev. Mr.,	301
Balcomb, Colson,	281	Burke, J. M.,	302
Vernon, J. E. n.c.,	281	Warren, E. D. L.,	303
Huntor, J.,	282	O'Neill, H.,	304, 305
		Walsh, R. W.,	307

MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

DUBLIN.—FIRST DAY, APRIL 7TH, 1879.

Before Messrs. W. A. EXHAM, Q.C. (Chairman), and C. P. COTTON, C.E.

DUBLIN,
April 7, 1879

Messrs. D. C. HERVE, Q.C., and John NEWWARD, LL.D., instructed by Mr. MacSKEEY, appeared on behalf of the Municipal Council of Dublin.

Messrs. Walker, Q.C., and Porter, Q.C., instructed by Messrs. D. and T. FITZGERALD, appeared on behalf of the Rathmines and Finglas Township Commissioners.

Counsel.—Mr. Walker, for Drumcondra, Clonsift, and Glasnevin Townships.

Mr. PEEW WHIT, Q.C., instructed by Mr. George KEEGAN, appeared on behalf of the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company.

Messrs. BERRINGTON AND CO. appeared on behalf of the Kilmainham Township Commissioners and the Great Southern and Western Railway Company.

Mr. J. B. KELLY, instructed by Mr. O'KIERDAN, appeared on behalf of certain ratepayers of Chancery in favour of extension.

The CHAIRMAN having read the Commission,

1. Mr. D. C. HERVE, Q.C., said—I appear before the Commission on behalf of the Corporation to pray an extension of the Municipal boundaries so as to include the townships of Pembroke, Rathmines and Rathgar; Kilmainham, Drumcondra, Clonsift, and Glasnevin, and certain portions of the County of Dublin, for the purpose of rectifying the city boundaries. This is a very important inquiry, and vitally affects the future of Dublin. This inquiry is directed in pursuance of a recommendation in the report of the committee of the House of Commons, of July 2nd, 1878, that the Municipal Boundaries of Dublin required extension. It is also connected with the general social movement by which from seventy to one hundred of the great towns of the United Kingdom are now engaged in bringing within the area of municipal taxation great districts which were built upon within the last twenty-five or thirty years, and which are in reality only extensions of the old towns, and immediately connected with them by the highways of those towns. Pembroke, Rathmines, Kilmainham, and Drumcondra have shown by their organization the necessity of coming within these laws by which for road and sanitary purposes local taxation is enforced. You will be furnished with the details of the foundation of these different townships, which are in reality part of the city of Dublin. I think it will appear in the present instance that these townships are not regular so-called suburban districts, but portions of the city proper. Of course, from the extension of wealth, and the development of taste and refinement, the merchants and traders of modern times were not contented with living in the city where they pursued their avocations and amassed their wealth, but almost invariably they have their country houses, which now from the great extension of the railway and tramway systems are practically within a very short distance of their counting-houses, offices, or shops, where their business is carried on. Anybody looking at the map of Dublin will see that Pembroke, Rathmines, and those other townships are in reality portions of Dublin and not separate places, and have grown

naturally by the development of Dublin to the south and east. It is a most remarkable thing that the whole of the district within the present municipal boundary of Dublin has been entirely built upon. There is scarcely any room whatever for any important extension of buildings within the present municipal boundaries. According to the census of 1871 there were 25,000 houses in Dublin, 1,000 uninhabited houses, and only eighty-seven then building, while the townships are composed, not of an irregular suburban district of country houses, but of great streets, closely built up with houses of a high valuation, which are inhabited by our most respected and wealthy citizens, who, to a great extent, escape city taxation, and who certainly should fairly contribute thereto on equal terms with their poorer fellow citizens. As regards the area of Dublin as it was defined by the Municipal Boundary Act adopted in 1840 you will find it is 3,624 acres, 3 rods, and 3 perches; and, I believe the present valuation as near as can be ascertained is £600,000 some odd pounds. The area of Rathmines and Rathgar, which for convenience we will call Rathmines township, is 1,020 acres, and the valuation £81,562.

2. Mr. COTTON.—The return given by the Corporation gives the area of the city at 3,800 acres, and the valuation at £640,000.

3. Mr. HERVE, Q.C.—The figures as given to me by the Town Clerk are as I have given them to you.

4. CHAIRMAN.—Rathmines is given in the answer from the Rathmines Commissioners as 1,470 acres, 2 rods, 15 perches.

5. Mr. HERVE, Q.C.—Of course I have not the answers of the townships, before me; at all events what I meant in opening was this, that the valuation of Dublin is between £600,000 and £650,000. The area of the Rathmines township is 1,020 acres, and the valuation £81,562. The valuation of Pembroke township is over £84,000; of Kilmainham, over £28,000; of Drumcondra, over £13,000, and of the portions of the county proposed to be taken in, over £19,000, so that the valuation of the districts proposed to be included within the new boundary is nearly £200,000; the present valuation of Dublin being a little over £600,000. There is no reason whatever why the prosperous communities of Pembroke and Rathmines should not be subjected to their fair share of the taxation of the city. They are virtually citizens of Dublin; they share in all the advantages of a great city; the city is the centre of Ireland, the metropolis of the country, where the law courts sit on their business, and where two great universities are established to give the best education; where there are great public schools, and where there is immense trade and commerce going on. It is a well-known fact that nearly every single person in these two townships of Rathmines and Pembroke especially lives by Dublin. The merchants amass their wealth in the city; there is a great number of most respectable employés in the different establishments in the city who live in the townships, but who are virtually citizens of Dublin. I don't know whether in the answers given by the

Rathmines and Pembroke townships to the queries sent out by your Commission it appears what was the valuation of those townships some twenty years ago?

CHAIRMAN.—No; they don't give it at all.

6. Mr. Heron, q.c.—But that will appear in the course of the inquiry, because it is most important as showing that this extension of the city into Rathmines and Pembroke especially has arisen from the natural development of the city, and not from any trade, as it were, growing up peculiar to these localities. They depend on Dublin and live entirely by Dublin. As regards the feeling of Dublin on this subject there is very great dissatisfaction indeed felt because the present municipal boundaries are so limited. They were defined by the Act of Parliament of 1840, on the report I believe of Sir Thomas, then Captain Lathom, in 1838, and it is now considered that a large number of persons who gain their livelihood and means of subsistence by daily avocations follow within the city, and others who have all the advantages usually attendant upon residence in the metropolis, escape the following burdens—they escape the burden of maintaining the public thoroughfares of the city entirely, although the thoroughfares are as much used by them as they are by any one living in Dame-street or Westmoreland-street; they escape especially in the Pembroke township in consequence of the careful management of the estate and there being no residence in that locality for labourers and people of that class; they escape contributing their fair proportion of the poor rate; they escape the taxation for lunatic asylums, the industrial schools, and reformatories, that most useful system which is now doing such incalculable benefit to the poor waifs and strays of Ireland; they escaped until very recently all taxation for works of civic improvement. Speaking on that subject there has been one most remarkable Act of Parliament recently, showing the principle on which the Legislature goes and is inclined to act in these matters, namely, the Act for the rebuilding of Carlisle Bridge and the erection of a new swivelled bridge at the Custom House. The bridge tax for these works has been extended to the Dublin Metropolitan Police District. I refer to the Port and Docks Board Act of 1876, which extended the Act of the 17th of Queen Victoria. Under section 18 of that Act, the Dublin Metropolitan Police District was defined as the district over which the tax was to be levied. It added so much of the township of New Kilmainham as was not comprised in the Dublin Metropolitan Police District, the township of Clontarf, and the county of Dublin lying between Clontarf and the Dublin Metropolitan Police District, extending the area most enormously. As you already know, the Town Council of Dublin by resolution of the 4th September, 1876, determined to apply to Parliament for an Improvement Act containing amongst other things a provision for the extension of the municipal boundaries, but it is not necessary now to go into the reasons why that was abandoned. The Corporation now recommends that these townships of Pembroke, Rathmines, Kilmainham, and Drumsanda, and also portions of the county as described and coloured yellow on the map before you, should be included within the new municipal boundaries of Dublin, with such rearrangement of the boundaries of the wards as may be desirable to secure proportionate representation. That is a matter entirely for you when you have heard the evidence on both sides.

7. CHAIRMAN.—Having regard particularly to your allusion to the Bridge Tax Act, can you inform us why the Corporation do not seek to get control over Clontarf as well?

Mr. Heron, q.c.—Clontarf is separated from the city by an agricultural district without a house upon it, of about a mile in extent, and in England and Scotland the principle laid down is that wherever a new district is naturally an extension of the town, beyond any doubt, it ought to be included, but wherever it is separated from the town visibly by any definite boundary showing that the district has grown up around its own centre by reason of its own advantages,

not dependent on the town, they ought not to include that district within the municipal boundary. I believe that is the principle. There are some very remarkable books recently published on the subject of that principle, especially by Mr. Rathbone, who has collected evidence on the subject, and who, in his pamphlet, lays down the principle I have stated. I understand there are some of the inhabitants of Clontarf who may appear before you wishing to be included in the town. Clontarf is separated by an agricultural district, and I am instructed by my friends of the Corporation that that is the reason why they do not propose at present to include Clontarf. These districts proposed to be included are practically part of the city already. We have applied to them for information in reference to the debts of the townships and other matters connected with the inquiry. We were received most cordially and informed that the information was sent to you—whatever you required, and no doubt we will have them while this inquiry is going on. The opposition from the townships in this case, as it was in the case of Liverpool, Glasgow, Belfast, and other great towns where they derived such advantage from the extension of the municipal boundary, and which have been made more powerful and united cities than before; the opposition arose from an objection on the part of the townships to the alleged great increase of taxation, and also their liability, as I understand, to the old debts of the Corporation. Now as regards the debt due by the Corporation of Dublin, the entire amount of the debt chargeable to the several rates and the municipal estates on the 31st August, 1878, was £856,854 13s. 10d., and that may be easily classified under three great heads. The first that I mention, by reason of its great amount in proportion to the rest, is the waterworks debt, the amount of which on the same day was £503,535 out of £356,400 actually borrowed, and the difference of which had been repaid. Of that very large sum, bearing an enormous proportion to the entire debt due by the Corporation of Dublin, the sum of £182,000 was borrowed from the Public Works Loans Commissioners, and it is being paid off by an annuity of £19,000 per annum, which will terminate in 1899. You will therefore see there is nothing very alarming as regards the future of Dublin in reference to that very large proportion of the debt which will soon be wiped off. It should be borne in mind as regards legislation, as has been recently remarked, we legislate not for the life of an individual but for the future and the prosperity of the entire country or community with which we are dealing. As regards the balance of the debt, the difference between £382,000 and £308,030, I am instructed also to state that the water rental is increasing at the rate of £1,000 a year, and the whole debt will at no distant period be extinguished, and that the revenues from contracts for water to the extra municipal districts are sufficient to cover the entire cost and maintenance of works and salaries. The pipe water debenture debt was on the 31st August, 1878, £72,010 7s. 8d.; that is not large, and there is a temporary loan of £6,000 which I don't trouble you with. The next account I call attention to is the Improvement Fund. The debt on the 31st August, 1878, was £72,960; that is an account of money borrowed under the 12th and 13th Victoria. That represents the balance then due out of a large sum borrowed for the improvement of the city, and as regards this portion of the case I have no hesitation in saying that on every principle of justice and fairness the townships are bound to contribute to this account. A large portion of that indebtedness arises from a sum of £50,000 expended for improved pavements.

8. CHAIRMAN.—Is that included in the £72,000 odd?

Mr. Heron, q.c.—The £72,000 odd is the balance of what then remained due, for more was borrowed and paid off. There was £30,000 for pavements, £9,500 odd for footways, and £26,550 for the new Cattle Market; and of these sums so borrowed, there remained due on foot of this account of the 31st

DUBLIN,
April 7, 1879.

August last £72,950, and also Lloyd's Bonds, issued to the Linmer Asphalt Company, £9,500 odd. These are all weeks of which the suburban districts enjoy the benefit just as much as the persons resident in the city, and to that taxation they ought to contribute. There is another large item of debt left by the old Corporation, a debenture debt, and there now remains due on foot of that—for large sums have been paid off—£192,275. As against that, there is to pay the interest on the debenture debt, and to meet other demands, the property belonging to the Corporation of Dublin, which now produces a net revenue of £18,000 a year. You will have it on the clearest evidence that the leases on the Clarendon estate of 199 years will expire next year, and that there will be an increase of about £5,000 a year from that estate. You will also have it clearly shown that the corporate property will be raised in a few years by the falling in of leases to £55,000 a year. There will be, therefore, abundant funds to meet the interest on the old debenture debt, if it be considered that the townships coming into the advantages of the city ought not to be charged with that debt. There are abundant and ample funds to meet it. Why should not the townships contribute to the public hospitals, which receive from the city £4,000 per annum? Why should they not contribute to the industrial schools and reformatory, which receive £7,000 per annum? and why should they not contribute to the lunatic asylum, which receive £7,000 per annum from the Corporation? They are part of the city. The gentlemen living in Finsbury and Edmonton townships are large employers of labour, and their workmen live in the city. As we know, Dublin has been as regards property, especially on the north side of the city, increasing in value enormously; and, on the other hand, property in the east and south of the city especially has been increasing in value. There is a remarkable instance of this in the decrease of the value of house property in Henrietta-street. The valuation of that street in 1855 was £2,282, and in 1879 it was reduced to £1,042; and it is only kept up at that figure by the King's Lanes being valued at £500. The remainder of the whole of that magnificent street is valued at only £442. That is a most remarkable thing. I have not got the return for Denmark-street or streets in the neighbourhood, but there is no doubt their valuation is going down, and the reason is really that the whole city is slowly moving east and south.

9. Mr. Porter, Q.C.—There has been no new valuation?

10. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—There was one valuation under the Act, and there has been none since.

11. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—The valuation has been reduced on the application of the individual owners. There was one noble house in Henrietta-street valued at £270, which has been reduced to £57 in that way. These are the general motions which I think right to lay before you. You will hear them in detail from experienced witnesses, and I trust you will come to the conclusion that the municipal boundaries of Dublin ought to be extended to what I would call the natural boundaries of the city. If you do extend the boundaries of Dublin to the natural boundaries, I venture to say the result will be a vastly increased power of organization, a greater capacity for development in the city, and a greater capacity

for improvement. In the reorganization of the wards there may be a redistribution of political power, but that is unimportant to this inquiry. Of this I am firmly convinced. I know I am instructed in this by every member of the Council whose wish is to improve the city, and who is most anxious, no matter what may be his opinion on other questions, for the welfare and improvement of the city; and I am sure that the new Town Council would be actuated by the same principles, and that they would wish to make, as I am sure you would wish to make, Dublin an united and splendid city.

12. CHAIRMAN.—Have the Corporation instructed you with regard to their views on this matter? Suppose the additions they ask were made, do they consider that, with the present number of members on the Council, the work of the extended city could be attended to?

13. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—That is with their present numbers?

14. CHAIRMAN.—Yes. The reason why I ask the question is, we had this question in Cork, and a gentleman who had considered the matter carefully, Mr. David Nagle, on a former Inquiry, of which I was a member, proposed a reduction of the number of the Town Council in Cork, and when he came to give us his views on the subject of extending the boundaries of that city, although only a small extension was proposed, he was of opinion it would be impossible to carry on the work if that district was brought in, unless the number of members on the Town Council was increased.

15. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—I have no precise instructions on the point, and as there may be some difference of opinion about it, I don't like to give my own view on it. The valuation of Finsbury and Edmonton is each of them over £50,000, and the best wards of Dublin range at about £40,000. Probably the proportion would afford some basis of representation.

16. CHAIRMAN.—It is not with a view to that I ask the question. Suppose the district was increased either altogether, as proposed by the Corporation, or not to the full extent, there must be a number of miles of road brought in, and additional roads of and reparation required over them, and also the management of the sanitary condition of the entire city is extended, and the question is whether the Corporation remaining at the same number would be able with their present officers to take up that work. Mr. Nagle's view was that in Cork the Corporation would not be able to manage the new district, and that there should be an increase in the corporate body. He suggested, I think, that the district proposed to be added should be made something of a separate ward, and a certain number of Town Councillors be added to represent that ward.

17. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—That would be the most convenient way to do it.

18. CHAIRMAN.—I would like to know from the Corporation, before the inquiry is over, whether they consider they have enough work for their present number, and whether they would be prepared to undertake the management of the added district—sanitary matters and everything.

19. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—I shall receive instructions, and give you their views.

20. CHAIRMAN.—That would be a very important element in this inquiry.

MR. JOHN BEVERIDGE EXAMINED.

21. Dr. Norwood.—You are Town Clerk of Dublin?—Yes.

22. And you were previously Secretary to No. 1 Committee?—Yes; previously Secretary to the Paving Committee.

23. And consequently pretty well informed as to the condition of the city?—I am.

Mr. John
Beveridge.

24. Have you any statement prepared showing the area of the city and its valuation?—I have not here, but there is one in progress. We have not been able to fill in some of the columns in it owing to our not having the particulars regarding the townships.

25. But as far as the city proper is concerned you have that return?—We have. The area of the city is 3,654 acres. (Appendix No. 1.)

DUBLIN,
April 5, 1873
Mr. John
Beveridge.

25. CHAIRMAN.—How is that? The return you gave us was different.

Mr. Heron, Q.C.—I suppose the valuations differ about the exemptions.

27. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. O'Brien in his return gives the area as 3,868.

28. Mr. Heron (To witness).—Where did you get that?—It must have been taken from the summary of ward areas in books of the Commissioners of Valuation. There is a good deal of new-made land, and the City Engineer would be the best person to give information on that point. The municipal area is now given at 3,868 acres, which includes 154 acres for the estuary of the river.

Examination resumed.

29. Where did you get these figures from that you are now reading?—I think those figures have been very carefully considered. There are difficulties with regard to Dublin, so far as the valuation is concerned. The table of 1871 is not now assumed to be the same as that adopted by the Collector-General. The figures of the valuation are very difficult to get, and for this reason, that different rates are leviable upon different valuations for different purposes. For instance, the gross valuation which we have sent in this return is £260,519, but you must deduct from that over £32,000 valuation, which is liable to poor-rate only. These are what are called half annual rents.

30. CHAIRMAN.—That is buildings used exclusively for charitable purposes, and paying half rents?—Yes. Then there is a large amount of land not liable to water rate, and that gives a different valuation for water rate.

31. Can you give us the valuation for improvement rate?—It must be a little over £600,000; but it could only be got at by going through the collectors' books for the different wards. If you deduct the £32,000 at which the land is valued, it will leave a valuation of £268,456, but from which amount you must deduct the poor law valuation of certain public buildings which are assessed by measurements under the Dublin Improvement Act, it is by a running resource they are assessed; and the result is to enormously reduce the valuation for the purpose of the improvement rate.

32. Dr. Noyes.—Such buildings as Trinity College and the several dock premises?—Yes, so that the valuation available in round numbers for the purpose of the improvement rate, out of which we must pay for the lighting and cleaning of the city, is a little over £600,000.

33. What is the valuation for water rate?—We have a statement prepared upon that matter by the Secretary of the Waterworks Committee, which you will have.

34. CHAIRMAN.—You mentioned just now land being valued at £32,000—what land is that? Is it land available for building purposes?—These figures are given by the Collector General of Rates (return of the Commissioner of Valuation, dated 10th December, 1878).

35. The reason why I ask is, that I understood Mr. Heron to say there was no land in the city proper available for building purposes?—At the western portion of the city there are portions of land—near the Richmond Bridewell, for instance, and in that direction, but probably they will never be built upon; they are not suitable sites for building.

36. Dr. Noyes.—Have you any return of the population of Dublin?—Yes. In 1871 it was 246,325; and the Registrar-General in his yearly summary for 1878 estimates it at 245,364, making allowance for the decrease shown by the decennial period prior to 1871.

37. What return is that you produce?—This is a return prepared to show the falling off in population in some of the western districts, and the slight increase in the eastern districts.

38. Please go through that—I will just note, first of all, that this only shows the increase of population. Taking the years 1861 and 1871, I find that in the South Dock Ward the population has increased from 14,166 to 14,429; in the Fitzwilliam Ward the popu-

lation has increased from 8,825 in 1861 to 9,064 in 1871; in the Mountjoy Ward the population has increased from 14,305 in 1861 to 19,437 in 1871; in the North Dock Ward the population has increased from 17,211 in 1861 to 20,248 in 1871.

39. I believe a large portion of the building that has gone up has been in that ward?—Yes; very rapid strides have been made there, and the ward has increased in valuation. The valuation of that ward (the North Dock Ward) in 1861 was £41,736, but that was before the great decrease in the valuation caused by the operation of the Valuation Act of 1862, which reduced the valuation of the city of Dublin more than £100,000, and consequently damaged the finances of the Corporation, as they lost for improvement rate purposes alone over £10,000 a year by that change.

40. You are now speaking of the 16th and 17th of the Queen, cap. 63?—Yes. The South Dock Ward similarly has gone up in valuation from £38,312 in 1861 to £49,473 in 1879; the Fitzwilliam Ward has increased from £38,769 in 1861 to £45,247 in 1879; the Mountjoy Ward has increased from £34,579 to £38,661. The valuation in the other wards has also increased, with two exceptions, but not to so remarkable an extent. There has been a decrease in the population in the Manus House Ward from 35,198 in 1861 to 33,729 in 1879; in the Rotunda Ward there has been a decrease from 39,289 to 38,913; the falling off is in the Usher's-quay Ward, which is one of the eastern wards, has been from 24,931 to 22,607; in the Wood-quay Ward from 23,361 to 21,683.

41. Taking the corresponding wards on the opposite side of the river, say Arran-quay Ward, what has been the reduction?—In Arran-quay it has been from 38,148 to 26,720, and so on with the others.

42. What is the total?—I have not taken the total of the entire city. The valuation of lands in the city which are not liable to water rate (exclusive of those of which the valuation of the half-rents is £2,521) is £2,521.

43. Have you prepared, by direction of the Corporation, any other returns for the information of the Commissioners?—I have been asked to note the statutes regarding the present boundaries of the city, and I have a few notes on that point.

44. Will you state the statutes commencing with the 3rd and 4th Victoria, cap. 108, which defined the boundaries at that time?—The Municipal Corporations (Ireland), Act, 1840, defines the boundaries which are at present the boundaries of the city of Dublin, and these boundaries were made the boundaries of the city on the recommendation contained in the report of the Municipal Corporation Boundaries Commission (No. 361, printed by order of the House of Commons in 1837). The recommendation is that of Harry D. Jones, Captain of the Royal Engineers, and I put in three maps which he supplied—see showing the ancient jurisdiction of the city and the proposed boundary, describing the boundary at that time, the second, the proposed boundary of the county. It shows that on the south side the Circular-road is the boundary, not the canal, as at present. It also shows a very large tract on the north side, between the Circular-road and the canal, which was not at that time within the city. The boundary towards Donnybrook is undefined on account of its being within the manorial jurisdiction of the Corporation. There were also very conflicting jurisdictions within the city which are stated in that report.

45. Give the Commissioners a general idea of these conflicting jurisdictions. Were they connected with the different classes, or how did they arise?—The report states "That there have been controversies from a very early period between the officers of the Corporation and the seneschals of the several manorial jurisdictions which existed in part within the city limits, both as to their respective boundaries and powers;" and the description of boundaries recommended, which is given at page 69, is that which was afterwards adopted by the Municipal Corporations' Act,

3rd and 4th Victoria, cap. 108. The last map in the report contains the boundaries as recommended by Captain Jones.

47. State the recommendations of Captain Jones with regard to the city boundaries, and give a general idea of the boundaries for the information of the Commissioners!—He goes through all the streets and defines them, the same as are now the existing boundaries.

48. So that the present boundary of the city was recommended to be a proper boundary so far back as 1836?—Yes; and the Corporation consider that matters have been greatly changed since then, and that the boundaries which were proper to be adopted then would certainly not be suitable for the present time.

49. CHAIRMAN.—Have the boundaries remained the same since 1836?—Yes. With regard to the boundaries of the wards of the city, it is under the same statute and under the same schedule they are defined. The city was then divided into 16 wards, as at present; but they were very different from the wards as they now stand. The wards were then called The College, Marston, St. Stephen's, St. Andrew's, The Castle, St. Patrick's, St. Audeen's, St. Catherine's, St. James', St. Paul's, Four Courts, Linen Hall, St. George's, Post Office, and Custom House.

50. How many wards were there altogether?—Fifteen, as at present. The 12th & 13th Victoria, cap. 85 recites that the division into wards was found unequal and unsatisfactory, and enacts it shall cease and determine on the 1st January, 1850. Section 9 provides that within three weeks after the passing of the Act the Lord Lieutenant shall appoint two persons, one a barrister of not less than six years standing to divide the borough into new wards before the 1st January, 1850; and provides that in such division regard should be had "as well to the number of persons rated to the relief of the poor in such ward, as to the aggregate amount of the sums at which all such persons shall be so rated." The particulars of the new division were to be reported to the Lord Lieutenant, and if approved by him, to be published in the Dublin Gazette. Sir Thomas Larcom, then Captain Larcom, and Mr. David Lynch, barrister-at-law, were appointed accordingly, and their award dated 22nd November, 1849 (confirmed by proclamation of the 24th December), is set out in detail in the minutes of the Municipal Council of the 1st January, 1850, and that division of the wards of the city has existed since. I have here a table showing the poor law valuation at that time of each ward; the number of persons rated in each, and the number of public buildings, with their valuation.

SOUTH SIDE.

WARD	No. rated	Poor Law Valua- tion	Public Buildings:		Excesses of Public Buildings:	
			No. rated	Poor Law Valua- tion	No. rated	Poor Law Valua- tion
West Dock,	1,001	47,666	31	2,079	1,240	43,482
Docky.	5,947	45,656	7	6,020	1,240	42,936
South Cty.	5,023	49,765	9	6,016	1,236	46,949
Royal Exchange	1,223	67,349	49	1,236	1,181	66,062
Hanover House	1,021	61,024	3	328	1,000	59,794
Freight-hall	1,085	45,370	—	—	1,043	43,396
Wood-quay	1,017	29,212	2	328	1,018	28,883
Hanover-street	9,094	29,249	21	368	1,077	28,840
Dublin-sq-yd	1,077	54,389	28	1,257	1,382	53,036
Total,	11,967	356,365	107	16,614	22,226	361,424
				Average	1,414	60,316

NORTH SIDE.

Area-quay	Total	No. rated	Public Buildings:		Excesses of Public Buildings:	
			No. rated	Poor Law Valua- tion	No. rated	Poor Law Valua- tion
Area-quay	1,258	31,322	9	1,189	2,127	28,114
Barrack	1,781	41,290	1	558	1,189	40,120
North Cty.	1,593	44,944	—	—	1,236	44,944
Botanic	1,297	50,798	—	—	1,297	50,798
Burkequay	1,745	61,470	—	—	1,745	61,470
West Dock	1,807	65,978	3	8,212	1,088	57,765
Total,	12,939	382,862	14	6,864	2,022	344,449
				Average	1,416	60,316

The average number of persons rated in each ward is 1,428 on the south side, and the poor law valuation £42,429; and on the north side the average number rated is 1,642, and the average poor law valuation of each ward is £42,314.

50. CHAIRMAN.—Is the separate valuation given of each ward?—Yes.

51. Are the wards for poor law and municipal purposes the same?—I believe they are; the rates are collected by the same collectors, and all the wards on the north side form a single electoral division of the North Union, and in the same way all the wards on the south side form a single electoral division of the South Union.

52. Then the boundaries of the wards for municipal and poor law purposes are the same?—I believe they are.

53. That is, they consist of the same streets and the same people, vote in the one ward for municipal and poor law representatives?—Yes. With regard to the dissatisfaction felt with respect to the boundaries as mentioned in the return to your question, Mr. Neville, a great many years ago, recommended the boundaries to be extended, but the recommendation was considered probably to have come too soon after the Act of 1849, which was regarded as a general settlement, with the concurrence of all the parties interested in the welfare of the city; that was considered as a settlement for a considerable period, but in 1870 the matter was greatly agitated again by the paving committee, and in a report dated 2nd June, 1870, signed by Councillor Gray, now Member of Parliament for Tipperary, the following passage occurs:—

"It should be borne in mind that the public requirements are greater than they formerly were, and that since the introduction of railways the wear and tear of the streets from increased and more rapid traffic, has become excessive. Your committee, in view of these facts, are of opinion that the satisfactory discharge of their functions in regard to cleaning, maintaining, and lighting of the thoroughfares, especially demands an increased income, and they submit that this should be obtained, by the means suggested, or by some such other equally equitable means as might be found most desirable; that the use of the streets by the rapidly increasing population of the adjoining townships causes large and considerably increasing additional cost in their repair and maintenance. Therefore it is necessary to obtain an extension of the civic boundary, to include the adjoining townships, the inhabitants of which are distant thereto by the improved and economic construction of modern dwellings, and who reside in the vicinity of the city, and let for these considerations would reside within the city boundary, some because their avocation lies in it, and others on account of the advantages to be derived from living in or near the city; and all having a direct interest in the cleaning and maintaining, lighting and watering of the thoroughfares, to which they should therefore contribute their share of the expense."

54. Was that report adopted by the Corporation?—It was adopted by the Corporation, and it was decided on the 4th September, 1870, to call a meeting with the view of promoting an Improvement Bill, including amongst other things the extension of the civic boundaries.

55. Was that determination consequent on the adoption and reception of that report?—Yes; and of the question generally being agitated at the time. There are a few facts in regard to the question of the use of the streets of the townships which are of some importance. I wish to put in evidence the report of the Dublin Tramways Company for the half-year ending the 30th June, 1878; and the traffic returns in that for the half-year show that on the Terenure route 1,229,749 passengers were carried; on the Sandymount route 539,121 passengers were carried; on the Donnybrook route 286,516; and on the Clontarf 330,062. These were passengers to and from the city, and consequently using the streets in the manner I have described, having their daily avocation in the city, and being as much interested in the welfare of the city and its good government as persons living

DUBLIN,
April 5, 1878.

Mr. John
Berkeley

DEBATES.
April 5, 1873.
Mr. John
Berwicke.

within the boundary. The traffic returns of the Tramway Company for the last half-year show that on the Ternance route 1,811,033 passengers were carried; on the Sandymount route 616,763; on the Clontarf 451,403; and on the Donnybrook 385,532 passengers were carried; and it will be seen that a traffic of this extent must have great effect on the condition of the streets.

55. Mr. Heeney stated that a large sum had recently been borrowed and expended on the streets in paving them; are these improvements of a permanent character?—Of an undoubtedly permanent character. It is estimated that these pavements ought to last for a period of fifty years at least, and not be entirely exhausted at the end of that time.

56. So that the value of these improvements will not be expended for that period?—So I understand.

58. Have you got a tabular statement giving the valuation of areas of the adjoining townships?—Yes, we have put that in return. (Appendix No. 2.)

59. Dr. Norwood.—I hold in my hand the return signed by J. Bell Greene, Commissioner of Valuation, under date the 3rd June, 1873.

CHAIRMAN.—At what is the valuation of Rathmines township put down in that?

60. Dr. Norwood.—It is not in this return. (To Witness)—Read what returns are in that table?—The total valuation of Pembroke township, as given in this for the purpose of water rate, is £24,384.

61. I assume these are abstracts?—They are from the return of the 3rd June, 1873, signed by Mr. J. Bell Greene, but perhaps the information of the township is somewhat later than that; the township of Kilmainham is valued at £8,663. Perhaps the township may labour under the same difficulty as the Corporation—that the water rate valuation is different for the valuation for poor law purposes.

62. CHAIRMAN.—In a list which I have here, and which was published in the papers a few days ago, Kilmainham is represented to have only a valuation of £7,341. It is here as £8,663.

63. Dr. Norwood.—What is the next valuation on the list?—The only other district with which we are concerned is Clontarf, and the total valuation of it is given as £14,636 15s. The return shows that in all there has been an increase as compared with the previous year; the increase being largest in the Pembroke township.

64. What is the increase in Pembroke township?—£1,700 as compared with the previous year.

65. Has there been any corresponding increase or decrease in Kilmainham?—An increase of only £65 over the previous year.

66. What was the valuation in the previous year?—The total is not set out here—about £8,583.

67. Now, with regard to the areas of these townships, state them to the Commissioners?—The area of Pembroke township is put down here as 1,489 acres.

68. CHAIRMAN.—In the published return of Mr. McEvoy, to which I have alluded, the area of Kilmainham is put down at 1,631 acres!—This is the return of Mr. Bell Greene, Commissioner of Valuation.

69. The return of the Pembroke area here is 1,592 acres, while in Mr. O'Brien's report, schedule F, it is 1,621. I suppose it is from that report that Mr. McEvoy took his figures!—The area of the Clontarf township is put down at 1,272 acres.

70. Dr. Norwood.—Have you got the resolution adopted by the Corporation of the 4th September, 1873?—Yes, I read from the minutes of the Council of the 4th September, 1873—

"Moved by Councillor Norwood, seconded by Councillor Gray, and resolved, that we hereby approve of the introduction of a Bill for the carrying out of the objects mentioned in this resolution."

The first of the items in the resolution are:—

"That application be made to Parliament in the next session on behalf of the Corporation for an Improvement Act, containing provisions for the extension of the Municipal boundaries; for an alteration in the burgess franchise; for the reconstruction of existing wards, the formation of

new wards in the city; increasing the number of members of the Council, decreasing the number of its quorum, and modifying its committees."

71. CHAIRMAN.—Was it suggested what the increase should be?—No. The Council had advised as a question was raised, and they were advised by Mr. FitzGibbon, Q.C., that some of these objects were outside their powers, and the result was that they proceeded with the items of the Bill which Mr. FitzGibbon advised them were within the scope of their powers, and they asked the Government to bring in a Bill including the three things they were advised they could not get themselves, namely—extension of the boundaries, alteration in the burgess franchise, and increase of the number of members of the Council.

72. Dr. Norwood.—These were the three items held by Mr. FitzGibbon not to be within the powers of the Corporation to obtain by private act?—Yes, he advised them they would be acting ultra vires in seeking to get these things themselves, and he said the Bill to obtain them should be promoted by some persons outside the Corporation, or by the Government.

73. And so the matter remained?—And so the matter remained until the present Commission was issued.

74. With regard to the question of valuation, there has been some question raised. You mentioned that the present valuation of the city is that laid under the 15th & 16th Victoria, cap. 63, with such revision as has from time to time taken place. Are you aware, of your own knowledge, of the process of revision that goes on from year to year?—No, I am not.

75. Then you can say nothing with regard to that?—No. The Collector-General himself has no official return of the valuation which is probably the best that can be had. (Handed in appendix No. 3.) This is an abstract of the valuation of the several wards comprised in the north and south city electoral divisions which are co-extensive with the wards, and the table states the area in statute measure; the annual valuation of property liable to assessment, distinguishing that into land; a separate column for buildings; for half annual rents and the total, and this is under date of the 10th September, 1873, and is also signed by Mr. J. Bell Greene, Commissioner of Valuation.

76. It appears to have been furnished by the Collector-General's department and we will put it in evidence.—The rates of the present year were struck on this valuation.

77. State the general results of it?—This contains the entire valuation; it specifies the several wards and gives the valuation of each and the valuation of property not properly within the wards, such as gas-mains, turnways, telegraphs, and so on. The gross valuation of the north side of the city is £292,623, and of the south side £377,816. The Collector-General states in his letter with the return, "the valuations on half annual rents included in these returns are chargeable with poor rate only." The half annual rents on the north side of the city amount to £13,028, and on the south side to £18,441, so that from the gross valuation there is £32,000 odd to be taken from which we get nothing.

78. CHAIRMAN.—I presume from the evidence that has been given elsewhere that you think a re-valuation of the city is essential, or do you?—There is a very general feeling that the incidence of taxation is not equitably distributed through the city.

79. But besides that is it your opinion there should be a re-valuation of the entire city?—As far as the city is concerned it is a matter of indifference to the people whether they pay 3s. in the present valuation or 2s. 6d. on a somewhat higher valuation; it will be the same in the end, except that they will have to pay increased income tax.

80. It is with a view not so much to the city as to your proposal to bring in other districts, and then I presume the other districts will say their objection is on the ground of taxation. I want to know whether

you consider that Dublin is at present valued below its real value, and if so, how much?—I could form no estimate of that.

81. Mr. Waller, Q.C.—He has put in a report of Mr. Gray which states that fact on the face of it, although he has omitted that part.

82. Dr. Newcead—If there was a union between the outside townships and the city they should start on a common valuation in order to have a common equitable taxation. There has not in point of fact been any re-valuation of the city since the one made under the 15th and 16th of the Queen, chapter 65!—There has not been a general re-valuation, and it has been pointed out by several witnesses before a Parliamentary Committee that the present system is a most unjust tax upon enterprise, for when a man makes an addition to his premises for the purposes of his business, the place is re-valued at once.

83. Although his less enterprising neighbour's place is not re-valued but continues under the old valuation!—Exactly so. It is stated that a great many premises in the city are not valued up to the true valuation of the present time, and on the other hand it is clear there are other parts of the city which are valued excessively in proportion; that is, the poorer parts of the city.

84. Are you aware whether the present municipal boundaries are regarded with satisfaction or dissatisfaction by the ratepayers?—I can't answer for the ratepayers, but taking the Corporation to represent them, the Corporation are decidedly of opinion that an alteration is necessary, and they have on more than one occasion passed a resolution to that effect. The resolution to which I have referred was passed by a large majority; in fact, there were only four dissentients, and one of them objected on the ground that it would interfere with the power of political parties in the Corporation.

85. But as to the general principle there is very general unanimity!—Yes.

86. On what grounds do they found their objections to the present system?—Those most strongly urged are with regard to the excessive wear and tear on the thoroughfares, the cost of maintaining which falls entirely on those living within the city, although others have the advantage. Besides there is no doubt that if the boundaries were extended many public matters could be better administered than they are. For instance, the same sanitary inspectors and the same food inspectors could act for the included district as well, and there would be less change. You will have before you the Captain of the Fire Brigade, and he will tell you that in his department the efficiency would be increased and that with very little additional taxation. The townships are as much interested in many other sanitary improvements as the city, such as the establishment of a Convalescent Home, which the Corporation are now endeavouring to establish.

87. How, in your opinion, does the question of poor relief and the sustenance of lunatic and industrial schools operate against the city as compared with the townships?—In the townships there is not sufficient accommodation for the labouring classes, and the result is that they are mostly housed in the tenements of the city. The townships have all the advantage of artisan labour and ordinary labour supplied from the city, while they have none of the disadvantages which always attach to the lower class.

88. When these people get into bad health and old age, what occurs?—When they get knocked up by illness they come to our hospitals, which are to some extent also resorted to by people living outside the boundaries. The poor of these places, as well as of the city, come to our hospitals, and it is beyond all doubt that the townships should contribute not in proportion to the present county at large charges which would be a very small amount compared with their great valuation, but in a fair and due proportion, seeing that the lower classes who use the lunatic asylums, reformatories, and industrial schools and public hospitals are as much the lower class of the

townships as they are of the city. They have all the advantages, but none of the charges.

89. In fact all these splendid buildings in the townships have been erected by the artisans residing within the city of Dublin!—Quite so. The opinion of the municipal body on that subject is set forth in the resolution of the 4th September, 1876.

90. Which you have already read!—Yes.

91. And which was mentioned in the answer to query No. 71?—Yes.

92. With regard to the city debt, have you a return of the annual amount of the Borough Fund and of the debts upon it and the other funds of the Corporation?—The City Accountant will give in a return showing the whole of these debts, and giving the figures in detail. He will also give a return of the taxation of the city, and of the rates being levied in the present year.

93. CHAIRMAN.—You will give us a return of the rates levied for the last five years?—Yes. We have prepared it in a different way from those furnished by other municipalities. (See Appendix No. 4.)

94. DR. NEWCEAD.—It is necessary that he should state how it differs from those prepared by the other municipalities, in order that a proper basis of comparison may be arrived at.—The municipal rates levied in Dublin for the present year for all purposes amount to £s. 6d. in the pound. That is made up of the following—Improvement rate, 2s. 6d.; sewer rate, 2d.; domestic water rate, 1s.; public water rate, 3d.; grand jury rate, 8d.; and vestry cess abolition rate, 1d. This return shows that the municipal rates, although the responsibilities of the Corporation have increased in many regards, have been steadily reduced. In 1874 they were £s. 11d.; in 1875, 3s. 7d.; in 1876, 3s. 6d.; in 1877, 3s. 7d.; in 1878, 4s. 11d.; and for the present year 4s. 6d. in the pound. The other rates levied within the city amount to 3s.—poor rate, 2s. 3d.; police tax, 8d.; and bridge tax, 2d.

95. Since what is the difference in taxation on the south side?—There is 2d. difference in the poor rate.

96. But there is no difference in the municipal taxation?—No; it is 4s. 6d., and similarly that has been reduced from £s. 11d. in 1874 to 4s. 6d. in the present year. The poor rate is greater—it is 2s. 4d.

97. CHAIRMAN.—Is it a fact that the taxation, excluding poor rate, has gone up since 1850?—It has declined from £s. 11d. in 1874 to 4s. 6d. in 1879, as I have shown, while the poor rate has gone steadily up.

98. DR. NEWCEAD.—The water rate commenced in 1861, which was the date of the passing of the Act?—Yes, in 1861.

99. And from that date the domestic water rate and the public water rate amount to 1s. 3d. in the pound within the city boundary?—Quite so.

100. The fire brigade also began in 1863, and that is included in the water rate?—Yes.

101. CHAIRMAN.—How is it that the grand jury has gone down from 2s. 2d. in 1872 to 8d. in 1879?—I am very glad you called my attention to that. The grand jury charges have been relieved to some extent by the Government giving larger contributions to lunatic asylums than formerly, and this year, when revising the grand jury presentations, the City Accountant came to the conclusion that there was a large surplus owing to the increased valuation. We have not actually got it in hand. He estimates that at £17,000, and the Finance Committee decided, as he and I thought they should, to bring that into account, and to levy only the balance required, so that that saves the city to the amount of £17,000, and to that extent we reduced the taxation.

102. Has not the city also been relieved by the recent Prisons Act?—Yes; we have only now to provide for the compensation of the old officers.

103. What would be the amount under the Prisons Act?—I think it is not very much—about £1,000.

104. Next year that £1,000 will be likely to be increased for the grand jury charges?—I should think it would. I think next year it could not be done under £s.

DUBLIN,
April 7, 1882.

Mr. John
Everard,

BIRMINGHAM.
April 1, 1873.
Mr. John
Beveridge.

106. Dr. Norwood.—According to the table which now lies before the Commissioners, the grand jury rate, in consequence of these reliefs by certain charges being thrown upon the Consolidated Fund, has been reduced from 2s. 2d. in 1874 to 8d. in this year, and probably 1s. next year!—Yes, but there are exceptional items in this year's schedule which will not occur next year. For instance, there is a very large sum levied for the paving of Brough-quay. That is being levied under the Dublin Port and Docks Act of 1869. The limitation of taxation for the purpose of improvement rate has been removed by the Public Health Act, and if paving is held to be a sanitary measure (and the Corporation so anticipate), we can levy as much as we think necessary under the provisions of the Public Health Act.

107. Mr. Corcoran.—What is the amount of that presentment?—£2,600.

108. Dr. Norwood.—There is a special section in the Port and Docks Board Act put in for the purpose of paving these lines of quays on both sides. It being considered that these quays, being the line of traffic to the shipping, were within the authority of the Port of Dublin. All these works are likely to last for many years!—Yes. The sum to be applied by the Corporation in paving the roadway at Brough quay is £9,604 8s.

109. What is the sum for lunatic asylums?—There is a very large presentment fee for the expense of lunatic asylums. Owing to the passing of the Act last session which requires the Corporation to levy in advance instead of being allowed advances by the Treasury, we had to levy a large sum, namely, £10,889, but that won't be so much in the future. That consists of three items, namely—recouping the Treasury, £1,502 advances to the 31st December 1877, £2,568, first instalment of £7,700 advanced by the Treasury to cover expenses of the intermediate period, and the third is the first presentment under the Act of last session, namely, £5,322 for a period of nine months, so that about £7,000 will meet our expenses on these heads. This year it was £10,000, but next year there will be a reduction of £5,000.

110. That will be about a reduction of 1d. in the £!—Yes.

111. How much does 1d. in the £ in the city produce?—About £2,800.

112. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know what was previously levied before that Governmental relief was given for that particular item?—I have not the figures here, but it was about £10,000 a year.

113. With regard to the Prisons Act, it appears you have only to pay the pensions of the officers!—Yes. It is £3,333 1s. 10d. this year, but that will be gradually reduced as the pensioners die out.

114. As to the sums levied for reformatory and industrial schools, what were they in the schedule of presentments this year?—They are £5,000 for reformatory and £3,500 for the industrial schools.

115. Are these sums for the relief and maintenance of children chargeable to the city of Dublin?—These children should have resided for a certain period within the city of Dublin.

116. What period does the Corporation require that they should have resided in Dublin?—A period of three years, but it is very hard to find out that.

117. Well, as far as they can they require a residence of two or three years!—Yes.

118. And the people are those resident in Dublin?—Yes.

119. And you state that they are from those classes which are employed while in health in the townships?—They are of the artisan and labouring classes, classes clearly necessary for the well-being of the whole community, which includes the population of the townships as well as of the city.

120. Dr. Norwood.—The water rate is charged at 1s. 3d. in Dublin!—Practically in Dublin that is the charge.

121. What is the charge in the different townships? Have you a return showing that?—We have. What

it is proposed to do is to put it in by another officer. Pembroke only pays the Corporation 3d., although they levy 7d.

122. Practically, as far as the city and the suburbs are concerned, they have a common water source!—There is a common water source except as to Rathmines. It takes canal water, and there is very great dissatisfaction amongst the residents on that account. I speak as a resident.

123. Do the pipes for the Dublin supply traverse the townships?—Yes, and extend beyond it.

124. Do they deliver any water within the townships?—I don't know.

125. You live in the township yourself?—Yes. All the corporate officers reside outside the townships except one, I think, the Law Agent.

126. You say there has been dissatisfaction about the water supply in Rathmines?—Yes, and it has been quite intermittent since the last frost. The Corporation is bound to keep the supply for the townships they supply at a defined pressure delivered at the boundaries of the townships.

127. The charges for the construction of these works are of course borne by the limited area of the city?—Yes.

128. And Mr. Heron stated that the debt upon that item alone amounted to something like £382,000!—The whole water debt is put down at £385,529 1s.

129. And the annual payment for making fund and interest is how much?—On the terminable annuity £10,000 odd.

130. The city bears the whole cost of that re-payment of that sum, and the townships get the benefit of the construction and maintenance of those waterworks?—Yes.

131. And they pay a certain sum, the particulars of which we will hear afterwards, under agreement in their several cases?—Yes. At present I see by the notice of rates in the Pembroke township they are levying 7d., whereas the city is paying 1s. 3d. for the very same article.

132. With regard to the other matters which the townships bear in common with the city, are you aware of the passage of the Main Drainage Act?—Yes; but I think you had better examine the engineer on that, as he knows the whole history of it.

133. The townships sent representatives to the Board formed for the management of the main drainage of the city and its suburbs, under that Act of Parliament?—Yes; they were represented on the Committee that was common to them and the Council.

134. A common Board for the management of the main drainage area?—Yes.

135. Are you aware that they possess a common police force?—Yes.

136. Where is what is known as the Metropolitan Police District of Dublin?—It includes Kingstown, Kilmaine, and taken in Kilmacud, Rathmines, and Pembroke.

137. CHAIRMAN.—It doesn't take in any of Clontarf?—No; there is none of the Clontarf township in it.

138. Dr. Norwood reads the Order of the Privy Council, fixing the Metropolitan Police District, from the Dublin Gazette of Friday, May 3rd, 1850, given at the Privy Council, on the 1st May, 1850. Council continued.—The Act which Mr. Heron read to you is the Dublin Port and Docks Board Act, the 39th and 40th Victoria, chap. 86, known as the Dublin Port and Docks Board Act, 1878, and it added Clontarf and portions of Kilmainham, not within the municipality, and upon that the bridge tax is levied.

139. When?—Yes; and on portions of the county of Dublin, on the north side, within certain defined boundaries.

140. Dr. Norwood.—There is a common police for the boundary set forth in the Order of the Council?—Yes.

141. The gas supply is also from a common source?—Yes.

141. From one source?—Yes; and the gas works are within the city.

142. And the contributions for the maintenance of bridges and quay walls are also common?—Yes.

143. Common to the two you have just described?—Yes, it should be mentioned that the city only is represented as regards the expenditure of that bridge rate. The city only is represented on the Poor and Docks Board, most of the townships are represented on the Board. They have a common poor rate area for the management of the two unions, embracing the townships and the city. The poor law union embraces not only the townships and the city, but a very large extent of country beyond.

144. CHAIRMAN.—Would the extension proposed by the Corporation go outside the electoral divisions, or would it be comprised in either the north or south unions?—The unions would be still very much more extensive than the proposed extension.

145. Dr. Norwood.—I believe Rathmines is in one electoral division for poor law purposes—I don't know the particulars; it is in the south union.

146. Is it on the Pemroke township in any division by itself?—I don't know; Pemroke is in the Donnybrook electoral division, but I don't know the exact boundaries for the poor rate purposes, or how they ran in that neighbourhood.

147. The maintenance of a considerable line of road, at the Rock-road, is common to the townships and the city?—It is; unfortunately for the city.

148. A small portion is in the county?—Yes.

149. Mr. Cottenham.—In which township?—In Pemroke and Blackrock, and portion of the county Dublin. It is divided into three portions, and the expenses must be supplied by the parishes of Rathdown, the parishes of Dublin, and the County of the City, in equal parts.

150. Have the expenses of that road been heavy?—Yes; the expenses have been extremely heavy, and if the Corporation maintained their roads at the same rate as that has been maintained by the Board of Public Works, while in its charge, the city would have been bankrupt long ago.

151. Do I understand that theaney of Dublin pays one-third?—Yes; we had to present last Michaelmas for over £1,100 for that road. The poor rate in the several electoral divisions is as follows—Donnybrook 1s 8d., Rathmines 1s 8d., Rathfarnham 2s 3d., Wardschurch 2s 2d., Tallaght 2s 2d., Clondalkin 2s 4d., Palmerstown 1s 10d.

152. And this year upon that side of Dublin it is now much—2s. 4d. on the south side, and 2s. 2d. on the north side.

153. What is the police rate in Dublin?—Eight pence in the pound.

154. What is it in the townships?—It is the same all over the Metropolitan Police District.

155. Do you know what the bridge tax is?—Yes; two pence, levied equally, over the entire bridge area.

156. You have not got a return of the taxable contribution for water from the townships?—I know what they are.

157. State them.—The rate is, on the valuation, 3d. in Pemroke, 4d. in Kilmainham, 4d. in Clontarf, 4d. in Blackrock, and 5d. in Kingstown.

158. They contribute no portion of the public water rates?—No; they contribute these rentals to us.

159. Do they contribute anything towards the fire brigade?—Nothing for that purpose. It is a contract to supply them with water only.

160. But to the support of the Dublin fire brigade they contribute nothing?—Nothing.

161. Are you aware that upon several occasions they have had to obtain the assistance of the city fire brigade upon emergency?—Occasionally, yes.

162. The gross municipal debt chargeable to the borough fund and to the municipal the rates is £566,634 1s 10d?—Yes.

163. What were the city presements last year for

hospitals?—The city presentation for the support of hospitals last year was £3,985 12s.

164. Are most of the hospitals within the boundaries of the city?—Yes, most of them are.

165. What are the hospitals outside the city boundaries?—The Hospital for Incurables is in the Pemroke township.

166. What township is the City of Dublin Hospital in?—In the Pemroke township also.

167. What was the contribution for these hospitals?—£300 for the Hospital for Incurables.

168. And for the City of Dublin how much?—£300 also.

169. CHAIRMAN.—How much in all do the Corporations contribute to hospitals outside the city boundary?—£300.

170. Dr. Norwood.—Are you aware whether the townships contribute anything towards these hospitals?—No, I am not aware whether they have, for I never saw the particulars, as the townships declined to give us information.

171. What information did you ask for?—The townships contribute to certain county-at-large charges, and, possibly, there is some small contribution for the hospitals, but it would be infinitesimal in regard to their extent and valuation. We believe the amount is very small.

172. Read the letter you wrote asking information from these townships.—One letter was written on the 14th December last to each of the Secretaries of the Townships Commissioners.

“Referring to the Committee of Inquiry about to take evidence, would you be so good as to supply the information sought by the several questions—(1.) The date of last audit and debt at the time, first an account of money borrowed, and second an account of the balance of assets and liabilities. (2.) The annual revenue for township sums. (3.) Annual charges thereto, and the tendency of late charges whether to exceed revenue, or vice versa. (4.) The value of the estate, if any, of the Commissioners, and the revenue, if any, derived therefrom. (5.) The taxation is the £, but for township rate, police rate, poor rate, bridge tax, etc., etc.”

173. CHAIRMAN.—How is it you came to give that £600 a year for those hospitals outside the borough boundary?—We have power to make a presentation in aid of hospitals under several statutes, 5th of Geo. III, cap. 30, 25th Geo. III, cap. 39; 45 Geo. III, cap. 111; 47 Geo. III, cap. 50; and 49 Geo. III, cap. 56. The reason for one of these quotas in regard to the excess of expenses over revenue was owing to the expense of Rathmines in 1875 appearing to be £11,688, while the revenue appeared to be only £9,015.

174. Dr. Norwood.—What reply did you get to that letter?—We got very polite answers, saying they had furnished information to the Commissioners, but we got no information.

175. And you did not get the information you were anxious to get?—No.

176. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—Would there be any objection to giving us that information now?

177. CHAIRMAN.—No, I don't see any objection to it.

178. Mr. Heron.—We got a good deal of information from a report of the Local Government Board containing the returns of local taxation in Ireland for the year 1877.

179. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—The return doesn't give the income or expenses.

180. CHAIRMAN.—We did not ask that, for at that time we had not the additional warrant authorising us to inquire into the taxation.

181. Mr. Heron.—The local taxation returns provide a statement of the debt of each of the townships.

182. Dr. Norwood.—Are you aware whether any classification or list has been made up of persons carrying on business in the city, merchants and others, who occupy premises in the city and outside in the suburbs?—Yes; there was some rough attempt at a classifica-

DUBLIN
April 7, 1879.
Mr. John
Berkeley.

DUBLIN,
April 5, 1878.
Mr. John
Beveridge.

tion of the kind, and we found in Thom's Directory that one-sixth of the merchants and traders had residences outside the city; but that return forms no index whatever, for the number must be larger, as there were several persons we knew who had residences outside the city, although they were not stated in the Directory.

183. There are a large number of persons who occupy offices, and who do not contribute save in an infinitesimal degree to the city rates!—These are quite a different class; they have residences within the city, and they contribute. To persons who have merely a place of business in the city, and a residence outside, any change would make very little difference; but there are a number of persons connected with public departments, and engaged in large mercantile houses, whose sole reason for living in this part of the country is that they have business in the city, and besides, a large number of persons live in the townships in order to have the commercial advantages afforded by a city.

184. And they use the streets, and have all the advantages to be derived from living near the metropolis, and contribute nothing to the city rates!—Certainly; and they ought to have a voice in its municipal government. There is no doubt a very large number of persons who formerly resided throughout Ireland, are now resident near Dublin; their properties are easily accessible by the railways, and they have all the educational advantages of the city. The townships, moreover, have become built by turnways and railways to the centre of the city. I have here a return of the municipal corporations in England and Wales, which shows that a large number of municipalities have got extensions; so that the same movement is going on elsewhere, and is very general in England and Wales.

185. In about how many places have extensions been granted?—Extensions were granted in the following places—Barrow-in-Furness, Blackburn, Bolton, Bootle-on-Line, Bradford, Brighton, Berwick-on-Tweed, Bury, Chester, Cardiff, Darlington, Derby, Exeter, Gateshead, Gloucester, Halifax, Kingston-upon-Thames, Margate, Newcastle-under-Lyme, Newport (Isle of Wight), Newport (Monmouth), Nottingham, Rochdale, Ramsey, Southport, Stalybridge, Stockton-on-Tees, and Sunderland. The Association of Municipal Corporations has recently got information from other places, and there are sixty-three of the municipal authorities in England which consider their borough boundaries should be extended.

186. CHAIRMAN.—You are aware that Committees of the House of Commons have refused extension in many cases, too, and particularly in the case of Glasgow!—Yes; but Bolton has recently got two extensions, and Blackburn has been extended three times within a very short period.

187. Dr. Norwood.—I believe Belfast has been extended under the Act of 1853!—I am not aware.

188. Are you aware that the Parliamentary boundaries of Dublin include part of Pembroke?—Yes; it includes what is called the Dúnnybrook Division, and in connexion with that, as Town Clerk of Dublin, I have to prepare the Parliamentary roll for the whole of that district.

189. Does it include Fingal?—It includes the greater portion, I understand, of Pembroke, and even extends to Blackrock.

190. CHAIRMAN.—Does the Parliamentary boundary run out to Blackrock?—Yes, to the Cross at Blackrock, and it passes through Booterstown.

191. Dr. Norwood.—Do these districts contribute at all to the cost of preparing the list of Parliamentary electors or the revision of the list?—They give no contribution to the Corporation.

192. Are you aware whether they contribute anything whatever towards the cost of revising the list?—I take it they must contribute in some form or other. I am not aware. I should think the electors must be paid by them; I don't know from

what fund—either by them or the County Grand Jury. Our expenses last year were £1,183 in connection with the Parliamentary revision.

193. Are you aware whether the question of the extension of boundaries has occupied the attention of persons in Liverpool?—Yes; Liverpool is very anxious at present for extension.

194. Have you any return with regard to it?—Yes; I get some returns with regard to it. I believe Mr. Reddick has made mention of that place.

195. CHAIRMAN.—Glasgow is asking the Government to appoint a Royal Commission on the subject of the extension of the boundaries all through Scotland. There are a great number of towns in England in which the boundaries have been extended, and there are other places in which it was refused. How is it that in 1878 you had £1 in the £ bridge tax on the north side and none on the south side?—I don't know that; perhaps the Poor and Docks Board could tell you.

Mr. Heron, Q.C.—It is a mistake; there has been an omission in the return you have got.

196. Dr. Norwood.—Have you considered the effect of bringing in these townships with regard to the distribution of the rates and what would be the effect of the proposed extension on the city rates?—I have not considered it very closely, but that should be considered on the basis that the present rates are sufficient in the townships for all purposes. Probably the Corporation would not consider them sufficient to administer the townships—sufficient to provide for the sanitary arrangements and the carrying out of necessary works, and the erection of dwellings under the Public Health Act. Rathmines and Penrhos are essentially an urban population, just like Dublin. At present Liverpool and Wolverhampton are considering about extension of their municipal boundaries, and Bills are being promoted by other municipalities, Hull, St. Ives, and Blackheath, which was extended so late as 1877.

197. Have you prepared any other returns for the information of the Commissioners?—I have prepared a general abstract of the terms on which extensions have been made by special Acts in England.

198. CHAIRMAN.—The real thing would be—is there any town which you know in England circumstanced as Dublin is; that is, with a large Corporation and a number of independent townships round it, in which there has been an extension to the extent of bringing in all these independent townships?—Several townships have been absorbed into municipalities seeking extension.

199. Against their will!—Yes.

200. Give us the names of these towns where townships have been taken in against their will!—In nearly all cases it has been against their will. In Darlington the limits were extended in 1861, so as to include the townships of Cockerton, Blackwell, Haughton, Haughton-le-Skerne, and Whesoe, four in all. In Bolton there was amalgamation of townships also. The whole of the township of Great Bolton was annexed, and that part called Hanly, of the township of Tonge-with-Hanly, and the township of Little Bolton, except the detached portions, and of the township of Runcorn, so much as lies within certain detailed points.

201. Dr. Norwood.—When was that amalgamation?—In 1873.

202. Have you any more recent than that. I think you mentioned one of 1877!—Although Bolton got an extension in 1873 it got another in 1877, so as to include part of the district of Hollywell, and there was another ward constituted and the number of aldermen and councillors increased, and portion of the district of the Local Board of Health which was not added to the borough was formed part of the rural sanitary district,

203. Coming on to Blackburn in 1877, what occurred?—The Blackburn Extension Act recites in the preamble,—

"That the population of certain places outside and adj-

sent to the borough, and situate in the townships of Witton and Livesey, which, with the municipal borough, are portions of the township of Little Harwood, form the Parliamentary Borough, has increased and is increasing, and that it is expedient that the boundaries of the municipal borough be extended so as to be co-extensive with the Parliamentary Borough, and that the number of aldermen and of councillors be increased; it relates to the Gas Company being empowered to supply gas to the borough and the neighbourhood."

204. That is on all fours with this proposal?—Yes. Section 2 provides that the Act shall come into operation for the formation of the burgess toll, and provides that the residents of the outlying districts shall become burgesses of the town.

205. Dr. *Norwood*.—We put in formally the documents and returns mentioned in the course of the examination.

206. CHAIRMAN.—Do you intend to ask Mr. Bevinly whether or not the Corporation have considered the question?—Supposing the districts they propose to include were brought within the city, would the Corporation, with their present numbers, be able to discharge the duties of the extended district?

207. Mr. *Heron*, q.c.—We have not made up our minds upon that yet; we are considering it.

208. CHAIRMAN.—Are we to understand the proposal of the Corporation to be, that the districts they desire to include should be brought in on the rates they are now paying, or on the rates the city is paying? Is it proposed, for instance, that Bathmunes shall come in only paying 3s. 4d., which was what they paid last year, and that Dublin shall remain paying as at present?

Mr. *Heron*, q.c.—We have a plan, which we are considering.

Cross-examined (by Mr. Walker, q.c., on behalf of the Bathmunes and Dromcomlin Township Commissioners).

209. Bathmunes has, as I understood it, a population of some 23,000. The last census was 20,000 and odd?—Yes.

210. It is now about 23,000—that is about correct?—The population in 1871 is stated to be 20,600.

211. Then we may take it as 23,000. Have you given us the valuation?—I can't say we have it correctly.

212. I have it, £96,000?—The latest I could obtain was £81,500.

213. The area is 1,472a. 0r. 16r. 1—Yes.

214. What is the taxation?—A improvement rate?—2s. 4d., I think.

215. I will tell you how that stands at once. There is power in the Bathmunes Act of 1847, under special circumstances, with the consent of the ratepayers, to levy 4d. over the 2s., and that has only been done in two cases. We have the 2s. rate, and, of course, poor rate, and the bridge tax and the police tax, varying according to the requirements of the time. Tell me now, having regard to the rating there, the population and the acreage of that important township, what advantages do you propose to give them by the union with the Corporation?—I could hardly be prepared to answer that myself.

216. Do you propose any?—Yes; I think the Corporation would propose to give them a better administration.

217. A better administration?—Yes.

218. You mean a better representative body?—No.

219. What do you mean by better administration?—I mean to say that opposite houses valued at very high rates we would lay proper footways, and, if necessary, would not be afraid to borrow a proper sum to provide for the comfort of the people.

220. I have no doubt the Corporation would not be afraid to borrow money. That is what you understand by better administration—the borrowing of money to provide proper footways?—To substitute proper foot-

ways, such as those in the city, for what at present exist in the townships.

221. Can you give any other advantage to this important body of citizens?—I think they should have a fire brigade. The present brigade, with a very small re-arrangement of the staff, and with a very small rate in aid, would suffice for the wants of the township, with proper telegraphic arrangements.

222. Anything else?—Yes. Certain portions of the centre of the roads have already been paved by the Tramway Company, and the townships have by that already saved a great deal in repairing their roads; but the paving at the sides of the roads should be completed.

223. You object to the roads in Bathmunes as being inferior to those in the city?—Yes, and the footways. Certainly they are being improved gradually, but as they are doing it out of current revenue it is necessarily slow work, whereas they should provide it at once for the wealthy class of inhabitants. There has been great complaint in the township of want of paved crossings. Poor as the Dublin Corporation is, they are ready to construct crossings whenever there is need shown for them. Now, Balbriggan is one of the greatest thoroughfares, and the right side as you go out of the city is used by thousands daily, and especially on Sundays. It is intersected by two or three roads, but there is no crossing to continue the footway, and the people have to wade over the road in mud, and it practically destroys the benefit of the nice tar-paved footway there.

224. You think by analogy to the present state of the paving in Dublin you would give them better?—I did not commit myself to that. On the contrary, I am quite aware they are in a bad state, and will continue to be so until a proper contribution is paid by those who use them at present and pay nothing.

225. Then it is by getting something from Bathmunes, and by putting that into the management of the Dublin streets, you think they would be able to give Bathmunes better streets?—I think the rate in Bathmunes is not sufficient for the proper administration of the township.

226. Mr. *Heron*, q.c.—What about the water supply of Bathmunes?—The water question causes great discontent in the township, and on the last occasion I felt bound to vote against the outgoing Commissioners, who are an extremely respectable body, and intelligent in many respects, but they fail to levy due rates for so important an urban district.

227. Dr. *Anderson*, q.c.—I believe the Corporation opposed the Bill that the Commissioners brought in for getting water from the Canal?—I am not aware of the particulars of that transaction.

228. Mr. *Walker*, q.c.—You sought by your Bill to impose the Vartry water on the townships in your Bill of 1861, and failed?—Certainly.

229. You got the reception of supplying them yourselves?—Yes; and it would have been a great advantage to the township to have taken the Vartry water; it will come some day.

230. You speak of the feeling in the Corporation as regards the annexation of these bodies. Has there been any public meeting of the citizens held to consider the question?—No.

231. Then you only speak of the feeling of the Corporation, which is the taxing body for Dublin?—Yes, as representing their constituents. Many of the members who voted for that annexation are themselves large holders of property in the townships.

232. The burdens in common, which you say they bear at present, are police tax and bridge tax. Both these you say are borne equally by the townships and the city?—Yes.

233. And in every respect the city derives benefit from their being equally taxed?—Of course, they pay equal rates for what is a common benefit.

234. But they don't derive equal benefit from the police?—On the contrary, the question as to the police has agitated the Corporation considerably.

Done,
April 6, 1872.
Mr. John
Bevinly.

DUBLIN,
April 7, 1873.
Mr. John
Beveridge.

235. But you have nothing to say to them?—We have to pay to their services. The townships are getting an undue proportion of their services to our detriment, and we have not the same number of constables now as before the townships increased in importance. The number of police in Rathgar is very large.

236. By what Act was Rathmines incorporated?—The Act of 1847, which has been three times amended.

237. That was at the time the Town Commissioners' Clauses Act, the Gas Works Act, and so forth were passed?—Yes; and probably that was an element in fixing the present boundaries of the townships.

238. That Act is at present the charter of the Rathmines body?—Yes.

239. And in 1842 they brought Rathgar and Sallymount by another Act?—Yes.

240. And by another Act in 1865?—Yes; that was the St. Catherine's Improvement Act.

241. That brought in Harold's-cross?—Yes.

242. And didn't the Corporation then propose for a clause, or go against the Bill?—I don't know, I was not connected with the body at that time.

243. Mr. Heron asked you a question as to the Main Drainage Act of 1871, and gives as a reason why the townships should be annexed that they then sent representatives to that Main Drainage Committee. That was so?—Yes.

244. That Act of 1871 is entirely at an end, and the powers conferred under it have expired?—Yes; the powers expired in 1876.

245. They expired in 1876, and in consequence aren't you aware that the Rathmines and Pembroke townships promoted themselves as Act of 1877 for the main drainage of those townships?—Yes.

246. And they carried that Bill?—Yes.

247. In spite of the opposition of the Corporation?—Yes.

248. Are you not aware that under that Act the works for the main drainage of those townships have been nearly completed?—No.

249. Are you aware they are in progress?—I am aware they are in progress.

250. Will you tell me are you aware of the valuation of Dublin; are you aware whether in 1849, when the Dublin Improvement Act passed, the valuation of the city was higher or lower than at present?—It was much higher.

251. And the 2s. rate you had then, or the 2s. 4d. which you had power to levy under the Improvement Act of 1849, gave you a much higher revenue than it does now?—We had only power to levy a 2s. rate under that Act.

252. I know you had, and did it yield as much as the same rate produces now?—It gave us a much larger revenue.

253. Under the Act, the 15th and 16th of the Queen, the valuation of the city was reduced?—Yes, it was so reduced as to discharge all the finances of the Corporation at the time.

254. Isn't it a fact that the valuation of Dublin is now a great deal too low?—I believe it is, but I am not competent to answer that question. Some poor districts are overvalued, and other districts are under-valued. It is generally granted that the valuation is under its real value.

255. Are you aware what additional income a re-adjustment of the valuation would give?—No, I don't know; I have no statistics on that point.

256. Are you not aware that the Corporation, or the Grand Jury of the City of Dublin, which is substantially the Corporation, have power to have the city re-valued?—Yes.

257. Have they ever sought to have it re-valued?—No.

258. Do you know the ground on which they have abstained from seeking a re-valuation?—I understand the ground to be that it would not be well received.

259. Isn't it because it would be an unpopular

measure?—It would increase the income tax and take so much money out of the country.

260. That is not a matter with which the Corporation have to do. Then the ground on which the Corporation have abstained from obtaining a higher valuation is because it would increase the income tax?—And it would lead to a re-valuation all over the country.

261. Then it is because it might lead to an Imperial measure, and a re-valuation all over the country?—Yes.

262. Will you give me any reason why with regard to the administering of the finances of the city and the getting of a proper amount as regards taxation over a fair valuation, any reason you can give why the Corporation have abstained from having the city re-valued?—There would be the national reason of sending three millions of money more into the Imperial treasury than at present.

263. Then except national and Imperial reasons with which the Corporation has nothing to do; what reasons are there as regards the administration of the city finances why they should not seek a re-valuation of Dublin?—It is surely the same thing in the long run whether the citizens pay 2s. on the lower valuation or 2s. on the higher so long as the sum required be the same.

264. That is no answer, but you may give it in order that the absurdity of it may appear. I think it is the same whether the citizens pay 2s. on the present valuation or 2s. on the increased valuation, for it would produce the same revenue.

265. But then you would be altering the taxing powers under the Act of 1849?—They are now practically repealed by the Public Health Act, which removes the limit of taxation for sanitary purposes.

266. Can you give me any reason having reference to the city why there should not be a re-valuation?—I should think that the Corporation, as a popular body, and representing the views of its constituents, knowing that the constituents would be against re-valuation, as it would entail so many immediate disadvantages, could not lose sight of that fact. We have felt bound not to press for a re-valuation of the city on that account.

267. Although it would be a fair measure as regards the value of property, and would only bring up the valuation of the city only to what it was in 1849, when the taxing powers were conferred on the Corporation?—There would be no advantages commensurate with the immediate disadvantages.

268. Then the reasons are the disadvantages, the unpopularity of the measure, and the national question?—They are bound to take those measures which are not opposed to the wishes of their constituents.

269. Are you aware whether Rathmines has a higher valuation than the city?—No; I am living in a house in Rathmines at present, for which I pay £70 a year, and the adjoining house is £75. Yet it is only valued at £40. I think Rathmines valuation is very low, as are all the valuations throughout the country. If you take the valuation of Kentish-town-square, and look at the accommodation afforded by the houses, you will find the valuation is very low, indeed.

270. As I understood you told us that in 1852 by the new valuation the Corporation lost £10,000 a year?—That is estimated by their engineer, who is still an officer of the Corporation.

271. And of course the valuation would now be higher as a whole?—Very much higher. In the natural order of things any slight rebuilding of individual premises would bring its increase, and that increase in such a long period of time would amount to a considerable sum.

272. Mr. Heron referred to the Dublin Improvement Act of 1877, which was brought in as consequence of the resolution of the Corporation to which you have already alluded. Are you aware that Lord Redesdale refused to receive that as a sort of hybrid measure?—Yes.

DUBLIN,
April 7, 1850
Mr. John
Bentinck.

273. Have you ever had the curiosity to read it?—Yes.

274. Here is the third section (reads third section of the Bill). You see the words "otherwise respectively mentioned"!—Yes.

275. And there is no "otherwise respectively mentioned," so that you sought to include the whole county in the city!—I did not notice the sections of that Act very closely.

276. I believe it perished in its birth!—It did; but though it failed, we have succeeded in embodying in the Public Health Act (Ireland) of last session most of the most important provisions in it, and all the water-works clauses in that Bill of 1857 have been embodied in a Bill subsequently passed.

277. I suppose you agree with the statement that as regards the revenue of the city from property, and the taxation of mining the resources are increasing?—Yes, from the city estate and other resources.

278. What is the Burrough Fund?—It is very largely from real property.

279. The water debt is also diminishing!—Yes, the debt is diminishing. The rental from the extra municipal district is largely increasing, and the debt is being paid off by the annual Slaking Fund.

280. And as a whole, the revenues of the city from property and rating are increasing, and are likely to go on increasing!—I don't say that the revenues will increase from rating, for I take it that as the value of the city estate increases we will bring the increased rental in aid of the rates.

281. Won't it increase as the revenue from property increases?—Yes; but the increased requirements of the city improvements must be met, especially in sanitary matters.

282. Mr. Heron said the revenues from the city estate were on the increase, and that in a very short time they would be increased to £33,000 a year!—Not so large a figure as that. On the rental of the city estate the City Treasurer is better able to give an opinion than I am. He anticipates the increase will be about £7,000 a year within the next two years. There will be no increase after that for a considerable period, for no leases will fall in.

283. Is it not a fact that all these burdens for which the Grand Jury Act provided have been greatly diminished by general Acts?—Yes, by the General Prisons Act and the grants in aid of lunatic asylums.

284. And the burdens on that rate will be diminished every year!—The burdens on that head will always be considerable.

285. The burdens are chiefly pensions to persons under the present Prisons Acts, and they are likely to die off soon!—No person is superannuated until there is satisfactory medical evidence that he is permanently incapable of discharging his duties.

286. I am sure of that, and therefore there is all the more reason for supposing these pensioners won't live long!—Yes.

287. As regards hospitals, the Corporation are free to contribute to the City of Dublin Hospital and the Hospital for Incurables, both of which are in the Pembroke township, and they do contribute £500 a year to these hospitals. Would you tell the Commissioners; or are you at all able to tell them the aggregate sum paid by the Corporation in salaries?—Yes; we have a return of that which has already been supplied to the Parliamentary Committee. About £15,000 a year, I believe.

288. You don't propose that Rathmines, for instance, should pay any of that?—Certainly, if the services of the officers are extended. If the Recorder's jurisdiction is increased, the township must bear a proportion of the salary, and if our engineer's district is increased the same rule would apply.

289. Don't you know that the Recorder is paid from a different source to a great extent now?—We pay the Recorder a salary.

290. You have mentioned about the Prisons Act—it is the same about lunatic asylums. Your contribu-

tions will be less hereafter!—Yes, but it will amount, as far as we can see, to £7,000 a year, and we consider that the poor people who are thus provided for are no match the poor of the townships as of the city.

291. The townships bear their proportion in the county-alms charges, which you think is very small!—I think so. I don't know the exact figure, for I have not been able to get it.

292. You say the principal persons who have their offices in Dublin, and live in the townships, are people who discharge official duties, who, having an office in Dublin, live out of it to escape the rates!—I never said that; they don't live outside to escape the rates.

293. Do they live outside to get fresher air?—Yes, and that is one of the great advantages; besides children have country roads to walk upon.

294. And, as a matter of fact, they do escape the rates!—They escape portion of the rates which should be common to us all.

295. Don't you think that the effect of annexing Rathmines and Pembroke would be that these persons who are free to live where they like would at once go out to Blackrock?—No. I think it would be a matter of indifference. In Rathmines and Pembroke the houses are particularly suited for middle-class people, while the area of Dublin is chiefly taken up by great mansions, built when there were many wealthy residents, many of which are now occupied as tenement houses.

296. You think they would remain where they are?—Yes.

297. And it would be no part of their consideration to escape the burden of city taxation!—The burdens, if any, would be something extremely small in the £. Suppose the Rathmines and Pembroke rates are sufficient to administer these townships properly—we don't at all say they are sufficient, but suppose they are sufficient—then if you take the entire account of the amount to be levied, you will find it won't make a difference of £1 in the £. The taxation in Dublin is 4s. 6d., and there is a general misapprehension about that. Some intelligent people have said to me—"You want to annex us, and to put 1s. 6d. on us, while we are only paying 2s. 4d." The tax is only 4s. 6d. as it exists, and it will probably not exceed £1, next year for all purposes, including Fire Brigade, and including an abundant supply of unpolluted water, got at an extremely cheap rate. The waterworks in Glasgow cost one million more than in Dublin.

298. You say the townships ought to bear a proportion of the grant to the industrial schools and reformatory, because the waifs and strays and Little Amis from all parts are sent into the schools. Now, could you give us the proportion of the waifs and strays who come from Rathmines?—That would be no index. The number must be extremely small, because there are no residences for artisans and labourers in Rathmines. Those who give the benefit of their labour in that respect live almost altogether within the city boundary.

299. Don't you think that what you say would apply also to the artisans and labourers of Kingstown, Blackrock, and other places?—Kingstown is a very large place, and has a distinct organization of its own, it has separate Commissioners and is a separate town, and it has all the advantages of being a new township, and it is very distant from Dublin.

300. More distinct than Rathmines!—Undoubtedly, Rathmines is a continuous portion of the urban district.

301. I think you meant in its constitution and geographically!—Both in constitution and situation.

302. You think the constitution in Rathmines is better than in Dublin?—I offered no opinion on that; I think it is an extraordinary thing that so many intelligent, active men come into Dublin daily and carry on business in it without having a voice in its municipal government, or paying anything whatever to its maintenance.

303. Perhaps they don't want a voice in the management. Do they ever complain of being

DONCASTER,
April 7, 1873.
Mr. John
Beveridge,

stripped of that important right!—No; but speaking as a resident in the township, I myself would wish to be a burgess of Dublin.

304. What is your opinion as to the representation of Ruthinians as compared with Dublin?—I would observe that in Ruthinians, for instance, taking my own case, I lived in a house on Ruthin-gate-road, and I moved into one of greater value in Kenilworth-square; my name is therefore removed from the burgess roll; there is no public revision of the burgess roll.

305. Do you approve more of the qualifications of the Commissioners and of the electors in Ruthinians than of those existing in the city?—The Commissioners are a most respectable body, but I entirely disapprove of the qualification generally advanced as a claim for a seat on the Board.

306. The high!—No; but the necessity of "having a stake in the township" by being the owner of houses.

307. You disapprove of a man being the owner of houses?—No; but it is evidently the interest of the owner to keep down the taxation of the house. There is an unhealthy competition in that respect between Dublin and Ruthinians. The Ruthinian houseowner has an unfair advantage over the houseowner in the city, for the latter has to bear the cost of these rates altogether. Any increase in the taxes of the townships will come out of the pockets of the houseowners, so they will take care not to let the taxation be increased, and the result is that the whole body of Commissioners who, as a rule, are large owners of houses and have "large stakes in the townships," must be against any increase in the taxation. "Having a stake in the township" is a qualification put forward for a Commissioner. The occupier would like to have a fire brigade, but it is not the interest of the owners of houses to have one.

308. Is it not the interest of the owner to have a fire brigade?—No; because he can insure his house.

309. You gave us as a reason why the townships should be added to the city the great traffic in the streets from the townships, and you stated the traffic returns of the tramways. Have you separated the Sunday traffic from the week days?—No, I have not.

310. Aren't you aware that the Sunday traffic doubles the week day traffic at most?—I have no doubt it is very large.

311. And the Sunday traffic consists of the people who go out of the city and come back again?—To see their friends, and that portion of the community who reside beyond the canal.

312. Have you made any analysis of those English townships annexed to Darlington, Bolton, and Blackburn, and in how many the annexation was opposed by the townships, and how many did not oppose?—I have notes of several towns.

313. But in these three cases was annexation opposed by the townships?—I think in all. I noted one case as a special case the other day in which the township was willing to be included, and yet it was excluded by Parliament.

314. Confusing yourself to Darlington, Bolton, and Blackburn!—In all those cases I believe the townships were against annexation.

315. That is your belief?—I can specify the cases.

316. Are there any townships about Bolton that were annexed against their will?—I have a note of that—

"In 1872 the boundaries of Darlington were extended. The measure was opposed by some of the principal rate-payers of the district annexed, and the rates outside were considerably less than within the borough. Under the statute the new part became liable to the then existing debts of the borough, and to the ordinary rates."

The limits of Darlington had been extended in 1872 to include the townships of Cockerton, Blackwell, Wessoe, and Houghton-le-Skerne; and by the Act of 1872 the borough is made to include the whole of the township of Darlington, and so much of the townships of Cockerton and Houghton as lie within certain limits detailed. The Bolton Corporation Act of 1872

annexed with the borough the whole of the township of Great Bolton, the part called Hanly, the township of Tonge-with-Hanly, the township of Little Bolton, except certain detailed portions, and so much of the township of Raworth as lies between certain detailed points. A further Act, obtained by the town of Bolton in 1876, refers to the Local Government Act of 1858 having been adopted in the township of Hallowell in 1858, and to the township having become a district of the Local Board of Health of Hallowell, and it dissolves the local board. The borough is henceforth defined to be as in the Act of 1872, with the addition of so much of the township of Hallowell as lies within certain detailed limits. A portion of the local board not added to the borough is formed part of the district of the rural sanitary authority. The Blackburn Borough, Gas, and Extension Act relates that—

"The population of certain places outside of and adjacent to the borough, and situated in the townships of Witton and Laversay, which, with the municipal borough and portions of the townships of Little Harwood, formed the Parliamentary borough of Blackburn, had increased and is increasing, and it is expedient that the boundaries be extended, so as to be as extensive with the Parliamentary borough, and that a new ward be formed."

And it refers to the gas company being empowered to supply gas in the borough and the neighbourhood. The 8th section refers to the plan of the boundaries as altered by this Act, being deposited in the House of Lords, and in the office of the Town Clerk. The 12th section provides for the division of the borough into seven wards, five of these existing to remain unchanged, another (Trinity) is to include the exempt area of the ward now known by that name, with "so much of the added area as is situated in the township of Little Harwood," and the last (St. Mark's) was to include only so much of the added area as is situated in the townships of Witton and Laversay.

317. You have gone back to 1861; have you any return there of the number of instances in which the municipal bodies sought annexation and failed?—I don't know that I can lay my hand on it; if I have the information, I shall be happy to give it. I have been question 4 of the Association of Municipal Corporations in their circular issued to the boroughs in England. "Have you obtained any extension of your municipal boundary?" 118 answered yes, and 9 no; and opposite the question "whether opposed?" there is no entry.

318. In the case of Bolton was the extension opposed?—I have nothing to that effect on my notes.

319. Mr. Heron.—Hallowell opposed it in the case of Bolton, and Parliament included portion of Astleybridge, and most extraordinary, they left out those portions which accepted the principles of the Bill, and did not oppose it.

320. Mr. Waller.—The main artery from the city, so far as Ruthinians is concerned, is the main road on which the tramway runs!—Yes, that is the main artery.

321. And the Tramway Company are bound to maintain the middle of that road!—Yes; and but for that the rates would have been much greater than they are. It has saved the Ruthinians Commissioners something very large annually.

322. And it has also saved the city!—Yes; it has saved the city an immense sum annually.

323. A great portion of the wear and tear of the roads is also attributable to the railways and the traffic to them!—Yes; the traffic of Dublin is very great.

324. And greatly increased by the railways!—I believe the city traffic to the railways to be abnormally great. Mr. Gladstone, when he was here, remarked that it was very extraordinary, indeed.

325. It costs a great deal more to repair the roads now than in 1849!—Yes; the prices have gone up enormously.

326. Aren't you aware that the Corporation have

to give higher prices for the repair of their roads on account of giving credit prices!—No ; on the contrary, they give no credit prices, and no Tramway Company can get terms as good as the Corporation ; the Corporation pay for everything in cash. We find our country contractors are very dilatory about sending in their accounts ; but all municipal accounts over £15,000 a year are paid within six weeks after the date when they become due, and that is generally about a week or a fortnight after the account is delivered.

327. Then you pay cash down for everything!—We pay cash within a fortnight after the account is furnished. I may add that our paving sets are supplied in Dublin at 2s 9d., which low price, I believe, is unrivalled here or elsewhere.

328. Mr. Piers White, Q.C.—I appear for certain rate-payers in Penrhos and Rathmines township, and as I understand the Commissioners are prepared to hear any statement on their behalf, I want to know from Mr. Beveridge what the Corporation propose, with reference to the scale of valuation on which the townships are to be incorporated!—I don't think there has been any decision on the part of the Corporation as to that, and I rather think that if there is amalgamation that will be a matter for the joint bodies.

329. They have not considered whether they propose to rate the townships on their present scale of valuation, or to have a re-valuation, so as to equalise the rating!—I think they would start on the present valuation as a basis, and if that was found inequitable the joint bodies could seek a re-valuation.

330. That being so, I suppose I am right in inferring that they have not made any attempt to estimate the gross income and expenditure under the new system, supposing they succeeded in incorporating the townships!—No ; it would be rather procedure, but if the townships are incorporated there would be little doubt a larger rate should be levied, to maintain the townships properly.

331. Do I understand you to say that the scale of valuation in the townships was not higher than in the city!—It is more modern, so that probably it is more in accordance with our modern prices, but I take it as a whole, and it is a low valuation as compared with the valuation in English municipalities, where the real value is the test for the valuation.

332. You estimate the present valuation in the townships to be somewhat higher than in the city!—The townships are very low in valuation, too ; for instance, a house on Rathgar-road, for which £60 and £70 a year can be had, is valued at only £32.

333. I am only asking you relatively, with reference to the rating in the city and the townships ; don't you admit that the scale of valuation in the townships is something higher than in the city!—I have no doubt it is higher than in many instances in the city, but I think very modern buildings in the city, of the middle class, such as those in the neighbourhood of the North-street, must be valued on exactly the same basis as in the townships. If, for instance, you take Rathmines, you will find the valuation is very low ; a valuation of two-thirds, as in our original valuation scale, would be fair, but it is only one-half, and it is clearly too low.

334. Have the Corporation made any estimate of the annual outlay in the respective townships, for the salaries of township officers, such as engineers, and so on!—They have not entered into any particulars of that kind, but I have no doubt the services of the officers, who were not past their labour, would be utilised.

335. Have the Corporation prepared any estimate of the proper number of representatives for the new consolidated body to represent the townships and the city!—The Corporation have answered that question by saying they consider there should be such a redistribution or readjustment of the boundaries of the wards as to afford adequate proportionate representation to these bodies.

336. Do you know whether that involves, in their

opinions an increase in the present number of corporate representatives!—The Corporation, by a resolution, have already decided that an increase in that body is necessary.

337. That some increase is necessary!—That an increase in the number is necessary.

338. Have the Corporation made any estimate as to the capacity of their present staff to carry on the business of the townships in case they were incorporated with the city!—One of the greatest advantages of amalgamation would be consolidation and reorganisation, so that the services of the several offices might be utilized.

339. Have the Corporation made any estimate of the capacity of their present staff to carry on their new duties, if the townships became amalgamated with the city!—They have not entered into the details of any such question, but the general opinion is that if there was a reorganisation the economy of these bodies should be placed under a proper accountant, and be published in the ordinary way.

340. Have they considered whether it would be necessary to raise the scale of remuneration of their officers, in proportion to their additional duties consequent on the bringing in of these townships!—No ; there is no proposition of that kind. As regards the question of the staff, there is no doubt much of the existing staff of the Corporation could be utilized for the extended area—for instance, the Fire Brigade and its captain could be utilized, and I think it would be unnecessary to appoint another superior officer in any department.

341. With reference to the Fire Brigade, would it not be quite possible to extend the benefits of that department to the townships by contract, without incorporating the townships in the city at all!—That is a very small question compared with the larger one.

342. But would it not be perfectly possible!—Never was asked the question before.

343. And you have not considered it!—No.

344. With reference to the contributions of the townships to the hospitals, I understand you to assign, as a reason, why they should be incorporated—that the poor of the townships came to these hospitals in the city as well as the poor of the city!—No ; there is a misapprehension about that. There are no poor in the townships—there is no artisan or labouring class. The townships have all the services of the artisan and labouring classes who are forced to reside in our tenement dwellings, and, having the advantages, they should bear a proportion of the burdens which such classes entail. Therefore, I say the townships should contribute to the hospitals also.

345. Have the Corporation at all taken into consideration what they would do in dealing with railway property in these townships—are they prepared to adopt the principle of quarter rating!—They would consider their interests to the full, and I should think they would act on the principle adopted elsewhere in similar cases. I mean one-fourth for the land occupied by the line itself and full rates for the buildings.

346. Shortly, is the Corporation prepared to adopt the quarter rating system!—No ; I don't know what the views of the Corporation are as to that, but I should think that if there be amalgamation the joint bodies would give that matter their consideration.

347. CHAIRMAN.—As to the valuation, I have here before me the evidence of Mr. Stokes before the Committee of the House of Commons in May, 1876, and I see in answer to Mr. Butt's question 2982 : "I do not know whether you could form an opinion as to how much the whole city of Dublin is undervalued!" Mr. Stokes said "I should say that the £900,000 could be raised to £800,000 and still be low. The chief of the low valuations are in the great streets and the over valuations in the small ones." Do you agree with Mr. Stokes that that is the difference between the valuations and the fair

DEBATES
April 5, 1878
Mr. John
Beveridge

BEGINS
April 7, 1922.

Mr. John
Brereton.

value?—I am not competent to offer an opinion; that appears a very high figure. There is no doubt some of the best parts of the city are undervalued and some of the poor neighbourhoods are overvalued.

348. I also find in Question No. 3045 Mr. Stokes is asked "Then might we assume the city to be valued on a scale twice so low as that of Rathmines?" and his answer was "No, I would not say that, Rathmines is considerably below the real value." Is that your opinion?—Certainly, as far as I am competent to offer an opinion, having resided for four years in the township and knowing something about it.

349. CHAIRMAN.—I shall now read the four next questions put by Mr. Butt to Mr. Stokes, and his replies thereto—

Question No. 3046. What proportion below the real value?—Perhaps a third.

3047. What proportion would you say that the city of Dublin was below the real value?—One-half.

3048. Then there is only a difference of one-sixth between the two—the one is two-sixths below its proper valuation and the other three-sixths?—Yes, upon that scale, and it is upon that assumption that I make it £300,000—that is to say, two-sixths added to the present valuation would make the city from £600,000 to £800,000.

3049. You would require, I think, to add one-third to 60 that?—Yes, it would be £900,000. I believe that the proper valuation of the city of Dublin, squaring it with Rathmines, would raise the city to £800,000 for its full valuation."

Do you agree in that?—I do; but I think his estimate of the increase is rather high; otherwise his views appear to be perfectly accurate.

350. You gave us an estimate of the number of people bringing in by the tramways, and in doing so you appear to treat the matter as if these people use the roads in the city very largely?—Yes, the people who come into the city must use the streets in walking and driving to the shops and other places.

351. Do you think that they contribute to the wear and tear of the city, or rather is it not the tramways, and then the tramways repair portion of the road to the saving of the city?—I rather give that as an index to the influx of people into the city to follow their daily occupations in it.

352. Instead of taking the tramway returns, has there been any calculation made as to the number of vehicles that daily go over Portobello-bridge, Baggott-street-bridge Mount-street-bridge, and the other bridges leading into the city; for these vehicles must use the roads of the city largely?—No. I suggested to some members of the Corporation that such a return should be had, but they appeared to think that the question was granted without giving evidence to that effect.

353. Then there has been no calculation to that effect?—No; but it would be very easy to have one made.

354. You have told us that the people of these districts contribute to the present sanitary condition of the city. I am not going to say your sanitary arrangements are good, or otherwise, although we all know that a great many people think them bad. Suppose, however, they were good, would that be an advantage to the people in these outside districts who largely use the streets of the city?—Undoubtedly. It would contribute to their comfort to have properly paved and cleaned thoroughfares to pass through when they come into the city, just as in the case of new bridges, or any other improvement in which they all participate.

355. As to the Fire Brigade, they are not bound to go outside the city if a fire happens to occur in any one of these outside districts?—No, they are not bound to leave the city.

356. Do you think it would be an advantage to them to have the properly constituted and efficacious Fire Brigade extended to the townships?—A very great advantage. A fire in a terrace in Rathmines would be a great calamity. In the city there is an abundant water supply at high pressure, but I don't know what the arrangements in the townships are as to the water supply at fires.

357. I suppose you get a return every year from the Government as to the county-at-large charges to be laid on the city for lunatic asylums, prisons, and all these different issues?—The Government sent a schedule showing the number of patients under the Lunatics Act last year. Now they only send an estimate without details.

358. And they say you are to pay so much, and if you don't pay it they will apply to the judge?—Yes.

359. Do you know how much less Rathmines and Penrhos pay for the county-at-large charges?—They don't pay any contribution for the poor classes resident within the city, and as there are few of the poor classes outside, and lunatics who become chargeable to the rates, they must pay something very small.

360. Surely, they pay some county-at-large charges?—Yes; but they are very small.

361. Are you able to give the difference between the two?—You have it in the returns of Local Taxation in Ireland, furnished by the Local Government Board.

362. I presume the inhabitants of Rathmines, Penrhos, and the other townships draw their coal supply from Dublin?—Yes, from Dublin.

363. It comes from the quays in Dublin?—Yes.

364. And I presume it must cause a very large traffic in the streets of the city before it can reach these outside districts?—Yes, undoubtedly.

365. Then the Rathmines people do not contribute one single shilling towards the relief of the injury that must necessarily be done to the roads of the city proper by the carting of the coal?—The argument, I think, on the side of the inhabitants of the townships is that inasmuch as they deal with the merchants in Dublin, they pay taxes indirectly through those merchants. They aid these merchants to pay their own taxes within the borough, but that is the argument of the defaulting ratepayer who pays nothing, for he also might say he pays indirectly, as he deals with his butcher and his baker, and helps them to pay their taxes.

366. But the man who lives in Fitzwilliam square, within the city, deals also with the city merchants, and yet he has to pay his own taxes on his house, besides, while the man who just lives over the bridge pays nothing.

367. Well, then, inasmuch as the man who lives outside gets his coal delivered over roads for which he pays nothing, in that way isn't it making the cost cheaper to that man than to the citizen who has to pay taxes for maintaining that road?—Undoubtedly.

368. All their commodities that come from the quays, and all articles supplied by the city merchants to these townships must pass over the roads of the city before being delivered in these districts?—Yes, undoubtedly.

369. Then there is the case of the cattle market. That is a common benefit to the whole community, both in the city and around it?—That debt is a charge on the city, but it should be charged on the whole district.

370. The man who drives his cattle to Rathmines from the market in the city must contribute to the filth and wear and tear of the streets, and yet he pays nothing?—These people have all the advantage, and they pay nothing for these things.

371. At present in Dublin the domestic water rate is 1s., and the public water rate 3d. Penrhos gets the water from you, what do they pay?—They pay no 3d., by contrast, in the valuation, but they charge the occupier, besides, 3d. on the valuation—that is 1d. in all, and they are bound to pay us, besides, for extra water, when supplied.

372. And nothing for the public water rate?—No.

373. Is it your proposal, or have the Corporation considered the matter, suppose the Penrhos township was brought in, that they should pay a domestic water rate of 1s., and a public water rate of 3d.?—I think it would be fair. They actually levy 1d. in Penrhos township, although they only pay us 3d.

DUBLIN,
April 6, 1879.
Mr. John
Beveridge.

374. You would get up their mains, suppose they were brought in?—Do the Corporation propose to pay them what the mains cost, and then that they should charge them 1s. for domestic water, and 3d. for public water-rate?—At present the case stands in this way—we derive a very valuable rental from the extra municipal districts. We also derive valuable contract rentals and master rentals within the city, and the amount of these is more than sufficient to pay the entire maintenance of the works, while the debt to the Government of £382,000 is provided for by the Sinking Fund and interest, and when that debt has expired there will be no necessity for any rate in Dublin for water purposes, but the townships must go on in annual assessment, paying as at present.

375. But suppose Dublin, by the aid of the Sinking Fund, gets clear of the debt, surely you don't propose that the townships, if brought into Dublin, are to be still liable to the water rate from which the Dublin people escape?—Certainly not, but I think there should be some arrangement between the several bodies as to the advantages which will after some time accrue to Dublin, and in which the townships should join hereafter. The present value of the city estate is so large and the prospective value is so much larger that it would be able to bear double the charge on it, and we think that if any of the townships are brought within the city, they should share its advantages and disadvantages.

376. Do you propose that, as the Sinking Fund benefits the citizens, and as the corporate property benefits them also, the outlying districts should have the advantage of these benefits too. Do you, in fact, propose to bring them in, and to deal with them as one and the same family, with equal rights and equal advantages; that, as the Sinking Fund goes on from year to year, they are to get the benefit of it, and that, as the property of the Corporation increases, they are to get the benefit of that also. Then comes the question—what do you propose to do with regard to the existing debts. Do you propose to bring in the existing townships free of the existing debts, or do the Corporation propose that all should go into one common fund, whether there is to be a common burden and a common benefit, increasing from time to time?—If the townships come in to share the present burdens they must hereafter participate in the prospective advantages, some of which are immediate.

377. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—The income from the city property more than pays the interest on the city debt, and the Corporation property is increasing in value!—Yes.

378. CHAIRMAN.—What is the meaning of this: A question was asked of Mr. Stokes before the Committee of the House of Commons, "1851. Are you acquainted with any instance in which an outlying district has been annexed to Dublin?—Yes; you asked me a question some time ago as to what was the cause of the embarrassments of the Corporation, and that was one of them, they took in a large district between the Circular-road and the canal, which was a most disastrous annexation for them, and never at any time has it paid the cost it has involved. They extended the municipal boundary in 1850, from the Circular-road to the canal, taking in another very unremunerative district—Mud Island, for instance." Is that the case?—It is, but it is not properly put. They extended the district of the Paving Commissioners so as to be coterminous with the municipal authority. It was from 1849 in the municipal boundary, but it was "no man's land."

379. What was done was there was increased taxation put upon it, but the ground itself and the area contained the same!—It continued within the municipal boundary, and the powers of the Paving Commissioners were transferred to the municipal body, not only for the area of the Paving Commissioners, but the whole municipal area. That is a very profitable property lately, portion being Mr. Stokes'.

380. Are there not distilleries and other large companies in some of the townships?—Yes.

381. Do they not draw very large quantities of grain from the stores and quays in the city, and also coal?—They do.

382. Then they pay no taxes in the city, yet they use the city streets largely!—There is a better case than that which is mentioned in that report—the case of Mr. Bolton, who draws all his timber and building materials through the city. He was inside the boundary, but, by changing across the canal, he escapes the city burdens, while he has all the advantage of the artisan or labouring class.

383. In almost all the towns in Ireland, under the "Town Improvement Act," which I have visited on this Inquiry, there appears to be an almost unanimous opinion and resolution that the land within two miles from the centre of these towns derives exceptional benefit from its proximity to the town, drawing its produce daily to the town, and selling it there, and in other ways deriving benefit; and, therefore, that it should contribute towards the expenses of these towns. If that is the case with regard to the small towns to which the poor people bring their milk and butter for sale, is it your opinion that it should apply in an equal, if not in a greater degree, to such persons as the owners of that distillery and Mr. Bolton, and those people living outside a large city, drawing their supplies of coal, &c., through the streets of the city?—It might be argued that portions of the townships are agricultural rather than building lands.

384. Yes; but that must be so almost everywhere, for it was shown in most of these towns that such an increase of age would not bring in perhaps a dozen gentlemen's seats at the most. In probably the last public act of his useful life, the late Mr. McCarthy Downing, at the inquiry held in Skibbereen, gave it as his opinion that the towns were used more by the people living within a couple of miles of them, than by the people in the town themselves. Do you think that that is so in Dublin—that the people of Rathmines and Penicote use the city more largely than the people of Dublin do?—Yes; the town's people may stay in their houses, but the Rathmines and Penicote people must come in and go out daily.

385. They come into the town and use the streets largely every day!—Yes; but they say they deal with the merchants in the city who pay taxes, and in that way that they indirectly contribute to the city taxation.

386. You say there was a resolution on the books of the Corporation with reference to the increase in the number of members. Has it reference also to the increase in the area?—The resolution of the 4th September, 1876, was moved by Councillor Norwood, seconded by Councillor Gray—"That we hereby approve of the Bill, &c." The first matters mentioned are these—one for "the extension of the municipal boundaries"; another for "the alteration of the burgess franchise"; for "the redistribution of the existing wards, and the formation of new wards in the city, for an increase in the number of members of the municipal council, decreasing the number of its quorum, and modifying its committees."

387. From that it would appear that the Corporation, or a certain number of its members, must have considered that the number are not sufficient to do the existing business!—That has been felt everywhere, but undoubtedly the number of the Corporation of Dublin is too small, for owing to advanced age or illness some of the members can't always be here, and the burden of the work falls on a few.

388. Suppose you were to supplement the work on them at present, by what could necessarily be thrown on their hands if they took these townships in, could the business be done at all by the present number?—I should think there should be an increased number, and that these townships should be represented, but that would be a matter hereafter to be settled.

389. Have you ever heard it discussed at the Corporation whether as regards the present Municipal Body, they should be left at their present numbers,

DUBLIN,
April 7, 1872.
Mr. John
Leveridge.

and then that there should be a number of new wards added, with new representatives, to enable them to do the work of the entire district!—There should certainly be additional wards in the townships, but possibly portions of the townships adjoining the existing wards might be made portions of the existing wards. That, however, would be a matter for the new body.

390. Can you suggest what the number of the Corporation should be to have the work properly done which would be imposed on them if this additional area was added to the city?—Not the actual number; I think that would rather be a matter for discussion amongst all these bodies afterwards. I remember having read that in the old Corporation the number was very large indeed—there were 163 common councillors, besides the aldermen and Lord Mayor.

391. Mr. White asked you a question about the rating of the railways and land under the 61st section of the Town Improvement Act. So far as the roads are concerned, suppose these townships are brought in, do you think it fair that they should contribute only one-fourth of the rates?

Mr. Walker, q.c.—They pay the full rate in Rathmines, and in Pembroke they pay five-sixths. They have a special Act of their own in Rathmines, and are not affected by that section.

Witness.—There is no doubt that land used for the purpose of market gardens is of enormous value in the neighbourhood of Dublin. The arbitration in the case of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company, North Wall Extension, showed the enormous sums given for them. The owners of these gardens showed they had enormous profit.

392. CHAIRMAN.—The bridge tax is levied on the whole of the Metropolitan Police district area, and in addition the portions of Kilmainham, Clontarf, and the county of Dublin mentioned in the 18th section of the Port and Docks Board Bridges Act of 1870. Do you know how the Corporation came to propose the annexation of Drumcondra and Clonliffe and don't propose to take in Clontarf?—They regarded Clontarf, as you will see on the map, as separated from the city—it doesn't join the city—it merely touches it at the bridge, and between that and the town of Clontarf (if it can be so called), there is an immense park.

393. If that was fit for building would it not be taken up and built upon—I could not say; but a memorial has come in from the inhabitants of Clontarf asking to be included. That memorial is to come before the Council at their next meeting.

394. The legislature has, as I have shown, enacted with regard to the bridge tax, that the residents of Clontarf should pay their share just the same as the man who lives in Sackville-street, and the legislature having adopted that principle in one instance of taxation, why should not the people of Clontarf be put on the same footing as the people of Pembroke in regard to the city taxation generally?—The Corporation do not think Clontarf stands in the same position. We claim the whole of the foreshore at Clontarf, and Baldyge at the back of it is part of the city estate.

395. Mr. Walker, q.c.—Don't the occupiers of houses at Clontarf draw their supplies from Dublin, the same as in Rathmines? There is no harbour or anything of that kind there to enable them to get these things direct?—No.

396. Don't they use the roads of Dublin as largely?—No doubt they do. The City Engineer was of opinion that Clontarf should be included. It is within our water district, but the committee were not of opinion it was a continuous urban district, such as Rathmines or Pembroke.

397. Suppose Rathmines and Rathgar and Pembroke and Ratoath are held to be parts and parcel of the city, isn't the same rule to apply to Booterstown?—No; it is separated from the city by a great tract of country, which has not been built upon.

398. But are not the houses there in the nature of detached villas and gentlemen's residences, and then is not it the same when we look at the houses from Booterstown to Blackrock, and then on to Monkstown and Kingstown and Dalkey?—No. On looking at the map you would take the Dublin district to be on one side, extending out to Rathmines and Pembroke; and if you were not acquainted with what is the city proper, you would think that the townships were all one.

399. CHAIRMAN.—Having regard to the advantages you say the people in the townships, and the portion of the county of Dublin you propose to take into the city, derive from their proximity to and use of the city, and that they do not contribute to the taxation of the city in accordance with the advantages they derive, or at all, as you say, and bearing in mind that the Legislature have put a bridge tax over the entire area I have stated, have the Corporation considered whether it would not be an easier solution, particularly if the outside people wish it, that they should pay a rate analogous to the bridge tax, which is 2d. in the pound, towards keeping up the roads and carrying out the sanitary arrangements of the city, including the cost of the fire brigade, leaving the city people to manage their own internal affairs?—Yes, that has been thought of, and discussed at considerable length, but the members of the Corporation are clearly of opinion that it is a proposition not to be entertained by a municipal body. There are various objections to it. For instance, it would be taxation without representation. The only taxes at present payable in the city of that kind are the police tax and the bridge tax. We have indirect representation for the bridge tax—namely, our four members of the Port and Docks Board.

400. But the townships have no representation on that board, though they are taxed?—They have not, and to them, I think, it should be most obnoxious.

401. But when the Legislature have sanctioned a rate of 2d. for bridge works without allowing the townships to be represented on that board, that would be no reason why the townships might not pay a fixed sum in the pound, as a tax or rate in aid, for the keeping up of the streets of Dublin, and providing for its proper sewerage and sanitary improvement, and also for the fire brigade, and that might be a solution of the difficulty. They have no representation at present, you know, of the bridge tax?—That system would give rise to endless bickerings. The Corporation would have the administration of such a fund, and the townships would be eternally alleging it was not properly spent. There is no reason why these people outside, who are practically citizens in everything but the name, should not take their part in the administration of the city and the expenditure of the city rates.

402. Is it your opinion that the representation in the Corporation would be increased in regard to its status by bringing in these outlying districts?—I think all classes of citizens should take an interest in maintaining a great city like Dublin, and there is no doubt there is a great deal of the wealth and intelligence of Dublin in the suburbs.

403. Do you think the Rathmines Commissioners, for instance, would be induced to become members of the Corporation?—Certainly. I think you would find them anxious to come to look after the money and to see how it was spent.

404. They might be very anxious to look after the money so far as they are themselves concerned, but if they are to look after the rest of Dublin they might not wish to give up their time and attention?—I think you will always find a sufficient number of men to come into a municipal body like this to administer its affairs. I have now got a return of the valuations of Heneage-street in 1819, 1855, and 1844, which I desire to give in evidence.

VALUATION OF HOUSES IN HENRIETTA-STREET.		
TOWN'S DRAWSIDE, 1875. Valuation.	TOWN'S DRAWSIDE, 1881. Valuation.	TOWN'S DRAWSIDE, 1884. Valuation.
No. 1, . . . £15	No. 1, . . . £20	No. 1, . . . £25
" 2, . . . 25	" 2, . . . 35	" 2, . . . 35
" 3, . . . 55	" 3, . . . 100	" 3, . . . 120
" 4, . . . 55	" 4, . . . 105	" 4, . . . 130
" 5, . . . 55	" 5, . . . 75	" 5, . . . 100
" 6, . . . 50	" 6, . . . 55	" 6, . . . 80
" 7, . . . 45	" 7, . . . 75	" 7, . . . 100
" 8, . . . 25	" 8, . . . 72	" 8, . . . 90
" 9, . . . 55	" 9, . . . 220	" 9, . . . 170
" 10, . . . 75	" 10, . . . 1,000	" 10, . . . 80
No. 11, . . . 50	No. 11, . . . 45	No. 11, . . . 650
" 12, . . . 55	" 12, . . . 60	" 12, . . . 100
" 13, . . . 55	" 13, . . . 85	" 13, . . . 120
" 14, . . . 55	" 14, . . . 85	" 14, . . . 120
" 15, . . . 55	" 15, . . . 85	" 15, . . . 120
" 16, . . . 37	" 16, . . . 37	" 16, . . . 60
" 17, . . . 25	" 17, . . . 15	" 17, . . . -
" 18, . . . 15	" 18, . . . 20	" 18, . . . -
" 19, . . . 15	" 19, . . . 20	" 19, . . . -
" 20, . . . 7	" 20, . . . 7	" 20, . . . 250 lbs.
<hr/> £1,562	<hr/> £2,220	<hr/> £2,368 10s.

The Commissioners then adjourned until next morning.

DUBLIN—SECOND DAY, APRIL 8TH, 1879.

April 8, 1879.

Mr. JOHN BEVERIDGE, Town Clerk, re-examined.

405. CHIEFMAN.—What are the portions of the map that are colored yellow, are portions of the area that the Corporation propose to take in, in addition to the townships?—Those are portions which the City Engineer recommends should be taken in in addition to the townships. The valuation of those portions is about £18,000. Then there is this land (pointing to the map) which would not be value upon which the municipal rates would be levied.

406. Are those portions largely built upon?—I am not aware. The City Engineer will be able to tell you as to that.

407. Mr. Norwood.—There are one or two questions that I now wish to put to you. You were asked by my learned friend Mr. Walker yesterday, what advantages you could offer to the townships for taking them in. Is the matter confined to the question of advantage alone—does not the question of justice enter into it also?—Undoubtedly.

408. Well, I forgot to ask you whether among the advantages the utility of collection, and the cheapness of the collection of the rates for the whole area by the Collector-General's Department, would not be an advantage?—The rates are at present very well collected I believe in Rathmines.

409. Do you know the per-centages paid for the collection in the different townships?—I do not.

410. What is the per-centages for collection within the city?—Two and a half per cent. is supposed to cover all the charges, but, as a matter of fact, there are a few other charges connected with that department that are not included in that. I may mention, however, that that portion of the Collector-General's account will have to be subjected to public audit in future.

411. I believe that department has been admirably managed of late?—Yes. We have taken into consideration in making our estimates for this year, and the estimates for the Grand Jury rate that there will be great efficiency, and a large saving to the city, owing to the efficiency of that department now.

412. There was another question put by Mr. Walker that seemed to throw some doubt as to whether the members of the Corporation represented the citizens.

Do you think that the same observation would apply to the townships? Do the representatives on the different Boards adequately represent the ratepayers of those several townships?—I do not think that the occupiers of houses in the townships are at all adequately represented upon the local Boards.

413. May I ask you if you know how many representatives of the townships are also representatives of the city?—Yes. Three members of the Council are also representatives on the Rathmines Board. Town Councillors Sykes, Shielton, and Hodgson. Four members of the Town Council are also representatives on the Board of the Penrose Township—Councillors Sir William Carroll, Callow, Carson, and Moyers.

414. So that if these gentlemen adequately represent their constituents in the township, by crossing the bridge of the canal the argument is that they inadequately represent their fellow-citizens who stand here. That is unquestionably the argument. What do you say to such an argument?—I think these gentlemen may be said fairly to represent.

415. Their fellow-citizens in Dublin and their constituents in Rathmines?—Yes.

416. Do you not think that the abilities these gentlemen display on the local boards they also display in the City Council Chamber?—I should suppose they would give equal services to both.

417. Have any of those gentlemen voted against the proposal for amalgamation, which has been occasionally, as you have stated, before the Town Council?—Councillor Sykes has voted against it. He is the owner of a very large amount of house property in Rathmines, and of course it would make a difference to him in the taxation. The general argument is that people live in the townships in order to escape the taxation which they would have to pay if they resided in the city. That argument is utterly fallacious, because if there be an equal distribution of taxation, it will come rather out of the pocket of the house owner than out of the pocket of the occupier. Rents in Rathmines cannot be increased; they have gone to the uttermost, and are enormously high. They are not likely to be increased any further, for people

DUBLIN
April 7, 1879
Mr. John
Beveridge.

DUBLIN,
April 8, 1878.
Mr. John
Beveridge.

won't give any more than they are now paying for their houses out there, no matter what advantages they offer. Therefore I say that any increase in the taxation must come out of the pocket of the house owner.

418. Do you know what the amount of fines and carriage licences is in the city?—I made a calculation of that at one time as well as I could, but the police accounts—the accounts of the police establishment—have not been published for a great many years, and there is great dissatisfaction and discontent on that head. As well as I could calculate from an old report, I estimated that they must be worth £5,000 a year, which in every other municipality is brought in ad valorem to lower the tax for road maintenance.

419. Then, in addition to the contribution of 8d. in the pound, of which you gave an account yesterday, as the contribution of the city towards the Police Rate, the citizens contribute £5,000 a year at least towards the support of that force?—Yes; in that way they do.

420. That would represent 2d. in the pound?—It would.

421. And the townships get equal advantages from the police force that the citizens do?—The Town Council are not satisfied that the Corporation—that the citizens get equal advantages with the townships.

422. With regard to the advantages, as a matter of fact, they do!—As a matter of fact the townships get advantages in the proportion of two to one.

423. Yes, because they get for 8d. what costs the city at least 10d.?—Yes; they get a great deal of service.

424. I have looked through the presentations for the county at large, and I do not find any account of the amount for the registration of voters for the outlying portions of the city which are comprehended in the county. Is that so?—I have not examined the schedule. I don't know.

425. Well, it does not appear here; so that that charge is borne by the city for county purposes?—Possibly the collectors are paid something for it by the Pembroke township, but I never saw the Pembroke township accounts.

426. Then you have never been able to make an adequate comparison in relation to this matter, as to the cost that is thrown upon the townships and the city, by reason of not having seen the township accounts?—We cannot do so until we get the accounts.

427. You have not got them?—No.

428. Have you ever seen them published in the newspapers?—I saw, I think, a Rathmines account once published in the newspapers. It was written by Mr. Collett. I subsequently applied to him for a copy, or the date of the newspaper in which they were published, and he was unable to give me the date of the newspaper in which the accounts appeared.

429. Was it long ago?—It was about the autumn of 1875 or 1877. It was two years ago.

430. There is one question I wish to ask you about the gas—as to what you said to the Commissioners, or to the relative cost of gas under the contract of the Corporation, and in the townships. Have you made any calculation or comparison with regard to the cost of gas within the city and within the townships?—Yes, the Paving Committee is also the Lighting Committee. The question of the cost of lighting the public lamps at the lowest possible rate has always been one that has been very carefully considered. We entered into a calculation as to that some time ago, and we found that the public lamps were lit at about 25 4s. per annum, and that about £3 1s. 11d. covered the entire cost of the service, including all the salaries and the cost of the maintenance of the lamp posts. It is a little more under the present contract, but in entering into the present contract the Corporation got for the citizens a reduction of 6d. in the 1,000 feet, which they would not otherwise have got, and the Corporation consented to pay the additional sum for the lighting of the public lamps in order to secure that great general advantage for the

city, and the result is that the citizens of Dublin have been getting their gas at 3d. thousand less than the people in the townships have to pay. That should be considered as one of the advantages that would result from the carrying out of the proposed amalgamation—the advantage of the benefit of any great contract entered into by the Corporation. That would be felt by the townships.

431. CHAIRMAN.—Following up that point—are the Corporation, having entered into that contract with the Gas Company, in a position to give the same benefit to an outlying district if brought in?—No, sir. Our present contract will expire on the 31st of December next, and it is anticipated that we will get even better terms than at present.

432. You have stated that the cost of lighting the public lamps in the city is £3 4s. What do they pay in Rathmines?—I am unable to say, but I got some statistics on that point, and we believe that the cost in each of the townships is greater than ours per lamp per annum. In addition to that the lamps are put out sometimes between twelve and one o'clock at night. In the city we have a cheaper supply of gas, and the lamps are kept alight longer. I have gone home to Rathgar between half-past one and two o'clock, and there has not been a single lamp lighting along the door of the establishment of Messrs. Hamilton, Long, and Co., one might consider that he was not in a populous neighbourhood at all, as that was the only light to guide one between Portobello bridge and the town of Rathmines.

433. Mr. Newwood.—I think you mentioned yesterday that one of the advantages of having a large valuation of the extended area would be the better terms upon which you could obtain loans for public improvement!—Undoubtedly. There would be the larger security to offer than at present. The limit for borrowing powers, which pressed so hardly on the Corporation under the Improvement Bill—the limit under that being £100,000—is now removed under the Public Health Act of last session, and we have power with the consent of the Local Government Board to borrow actually up to £1,200,000.

434. And there are public improvements which the Corporation have been unable to carry out in consequence of the circumscription of their borrowing powers!—That has been the case hitherto.

435. That has been so hitherto, and those improvements would be also important to the townships as well as to the city!—Every civic improvement such as the making of a new street is undoubtedly a common benefit—a benefit to them as well as to us. There is one other item in regard to the expenditure on the gas. An application was made to the Paving Committee to light the lamps in Merrion-square, and we entered into a calculation made on what they had paid the Gas Company, and we found that it cost them 5s. per lamp per annum, and as they are exempted from the Dublin Improvement Act, it would be illegal for the Dublin Corporation to light the lamps at the public expense, the result was that the Commissioners had to put them out. They wrote to us pointing out to us the danger that would accrue by the lamps being left unlit especially at the corner of the square, and the Committee, even at the risk of being charged the expenditure incurred, put up four lamps and had them lit in order to secure the safety of the traffic at the corners of the square.

436. Under the provisions of the Dublin Improvement Act, there was an extension of the length of streets previously under the Paving Commissioners to the borough boundary?—Yes.

437. And those streets had been, as you graphically termed it, in "no man's land" previously?—Yes.

438. Those streets were ones in immediate proximity to the different townships around the city?—Yes, that is so.

439. And in consequence of their being in dispute, have you seen it stated in the reports of your com-

DUNNES
April 8, 1869.
Mr. John
Beveridge.

mittee, that the cost of putting them into repair was considerable—I have.

440. That was all borne by the city?—Yes.

441. And it was directly for the advantage, of course, of the city, as of the townships close by, and to which those streets lead?—Yes; any improvement between the two, would be a benefit to the township as well as to the city.

442. Those townships have got the benefit from that?—Yes.

443. Mr. CORRIGAN.—Does that apply to all the townships or only some?—It would only apply to those on the south.

444. Would it apply to Pembroke?—Yes; and it will now apply to Drimcondra, and be of advantage to that place, because it has caused the city to go out towards Clonsilla. There is also valuable building ground over on that side, just within the city limit, and the Corporation tried to acquire it for the purpose of erecting slantsteirs on it, but their efforts were opposed by persons interested in building operations, and the Corporation failed to get it.

445. Mr. WALKER.—Have you made any estimate of how much of the £1,200,000 you propose to borrow, if you get in the townships, and get a large area, for the benefit of the city, have you?—If the townships were brought in.

446. Can't you answer the question. Have you made an estimate of how much of the £12,000 for civic purposes you intend to borrow, if you get the larger security of the townships?—The £1,200,000 would not then exist. It would not be the figure at all. The loans would be proportionate to the gross valuation. It is not a fixed sum. You could borrow with the consent of the Commissioners, on twice the annual value of the entire district. If we add to that district, you could add the valuation of the added districts, and you could borrow on twice the valuation of the extended district.

447. Then at that rate you could borrow £2,100,000?—Their large debt for sewage works would have to come out of that, and would be considered in reduction of any further loan.

448. CHAIRMAN.—You were asked, Mr. Beveridge, about the collection of rates in connexion with the extended district being easier and cheaper; what is the per-cent of cost thrown on the Dublin rates?—It is 2½ per cent. on the entire, and there is a small addition for law costs and other charges, which the Corporation contended should be borne in that per-cent—In other words, that the 2½ per cent. should cover everything.

449. It costs the citizens 2½ per cent. to have the rates collected?—Yes.

450. Now, we need not mind what they pay in Rathmines or those other places; but, suppose you get an increase of the borough such as you ask, do you suppose that the Collector-General could collect the rates on the increased district as cheaply as on the Dublin district?—I think so, undoubtedly; because there are no poor residents in the district that would be added, and it is the poor residents who live in tenement houses who cause the great difficulty in getting in the rates. The people in Rathmines pay the taxes potentially and well, I am sure, because they belong to the better classes.

451. Then, in point of fact, you think for that two-and-a-half per cent. the rates could be collected on any extended district?—Undoubtedly; and that there would be a saving in the end in the Collector-General's department, which he would in due course be made to bring to the credit of the joint borough.

452. You were asked just now as to the fares and licences.—The hackney-car licences?—Yes.

453. What becomes of the hackney car licences out there—in the Rathmines district?—It is within the Police district, I suppose.

454. Then, if any man in Rathmines is fined under the circumstances to which these fines refer, the Rathmines people pay because their fares go in to the Police

Commissioners; and, besides, that portion of the district is not fined so heavily for Corporation things as the Dublin people. Still the Rathmines people pay their own fares as well as the Dublin people, but they are not as large!—Quite so; but I am not in a position to form an estimate, because we have not got the accounts either of the Police Commissioners or the Rathmines or Pembroke Commissioners.

455. We know that all the prisoners for drunkenness from Rathmines or those districts are brought into the city, and tried by your city magistrates?—Yes, that place is within the Police district.

456. And it is the same way in Kingstown, and the fines go into the common fund?—Yes, I have no doubt they do.

457. I now desire to ask you a question as to the extended borrowing power you have got. It appears that at present the debt of both Rathmines and Pembroke is under £100,000—that is the amount proved—whereas in Dublin the debt is much larger. Now, in this contemplated union do you contemplate any expenditure for either Rathmines or Pembroke. Do you contemplate doing anything for them, except bringing in what they have to pay for their sewage as a tax on the city?—Rathmines and Pembroke townships possess this great advantage, they are new places, and not like an old city, in which great reforms of some of the backward portions are necessary—the clearing of the unhealthy portions of the city away. I am under the impression that there are very few public works of any great importance needed in Rathmines to any great extent; but any expenditure, such as a loan taken up for the benefit of their footways, would be of great utility, and that is a work that should not be postponed, and would add greatly to the comfort of the rich, wealthy residents, and conduce much to their health, because dry footways are most beneficial to health, and therefore a source of great public benefit. Such a passing improvement as that should be considered, and it is quite in accordance with modern ideas to execute works of that kind by loans, and spread over a term of years, and not give all the benefit to those who are to come hereafter, and who would pay nothing for it.

458. I presume from what you say that it has entered into your consideration the roads being made on an improving district, and on a district where the drainage on them is less than on the roads of the city; and I suppose the roads and streets of the city have deteriorated faster than those in Rathmines and the other townships?—Undoubtedly; and the traffic is much greater, and the reason of that is, that there is a continual cross traffic upon them in Dublin. The great problem with the Corporation of Dublin with their present means has been, not to keep all the streets as they ought to be kept, but to keep the unmetalled roads, of which there are eighty miles length under their control, —to keep those roads safe for traffic at all.

459. You spoke in the course of your evidence of roads that were under the Paving Board formerly, and that were now under the control of the Corporation—they are roads you particularly alluded to as running through “no man's land,” and so on. Those roads you say cost the Corporation a great deal of money, and they were very much for the benefit of the outlying districts, insomuch as they could not go into Dublin without passing over them. What district was it you alluded to?—alluded to the whole district of Ballybough, which is now covered with tenement houses for the humbler classes.

460. That is in the Drimcondra district, is it not?—No, it is in the north-eastern portion of the city. It cost the Corporation a great deal of money. We had to erect lamps in that district which was utterly neglected. We have also laid down several miles of tar paving—about £3,000 worth for one year—and the Corporation has, within the last two years, expended over £10,000 on footways made of Linimer asphalt, which is so durable that it will last for a great many years.

461. Mr. WALKER.—Point out, please, Mr. Beveridge, the roads that are in the city, and that are, you

DUBLIN,
April 8, 1878.Mr. John
Beveridge.

say, useful to Pembroke and Rathmines—the roads that are useful to those districts!—Well, I can; for instance, the road that runs from the South Circular road.

463. Can you point out the roads in that particular district, within the city boundary, that can truly be said to be of use to Rathmines and Pembroke!—South Richmond-street is the main avenue from the city to Rathmines. We have laid a footway on the western side of that street of Limerick asphalt, and on the eastern side of the street, as an experiment, we have laid an improved description of its pavement, at £s. 6d. a yard.

Mr. Parks
Neville, c.e.

465. Mr. Heron.—You are, I believe, Mr. Neville, City Engineer of Dublin—I am.

466. Have you for a number of years paid attention to this subject of the extension of the municipal boundaries—I have.

467. When first did it engage your attention?—Shortly after I came into office.

468. And did you report on the subject early?—I did.

469. Would you put in your first report?—I have got no copy of it but the one I now have in my hand. It was in the year 1855 I first reported on the subject.

470. Now, in 1853—at that time had the townships—had either Pembroke or Rathmines developed at all to the proportions which they both now possess?—At that time they were not half the size, or three-quarters. There has been a great amount of building done in Rathmines and Pembroke within the last twenty-five or thirty years.

471. I find that the valuation of Pembroke in 1853 was £42,212, and it is now—in 1877—£29,830. Very well. I will take it that the figures as to Rathmines in 1853 and 1877 exhibit the same difference. Well, in 1853 what exactly did you recommend as to the extension?—In my report in 1853 I stated on the question of extension:—

"Another matter deserving of consideration in any alteration to be sought in the Dublin Improvement Bill is the very limited extent of the area of the present borough. By the Improvement Bills passed for Liverpool, Birmingham, &c., the area was increased so as to take in the suburban districts, and there is an application at present making that Bill to accomplish the same object in Belfast. The principle is, I submit, perfectly fair, for there can be no doubt but that the inhabitants of Upper Lenson-street, Wellington-road, Waterloo-road, Upper Baggott-street, Pembroke-road, Percy-place, Haddington-road, Randolph-road, Erskine, Sondymount, Hanover, Rathmines, Clontarf, &c., all make use of the city, and are as much interested in the city, and in the support of those improvements, and of the maintenance and repair of it as those who actually live within its present boundary. Nineteen-twentieths of them have their offices or houses of business in the city, and pass to and from them daily, using the streets in every respect as much as if they resided within the municipal boundary. In Dublin, as in most other cities, that part which was formerly the centre of business and the residence of the opulent and wealthy, has, after the lapse of years, become decayed, and the habitation of the poor and most indigent of the population, while the city has been extending rapidly in the eastern and southern directions, which are inhabited by the better classes. Now the entire of the former or old part is included within the municipal boundary, while a very considerable proportion of the new districts are left outside of it, as above described. This is in every respect unfair, and throws an undue weight of taxation upon the better or westerly portions of the city. The Rathmines district was a few years ago formed into a township, and separated from the county, and the Commissioners have power to levy a rate of two shillings in the pound on the poor law valuation, for paving, lighting, cleaning, and sewerage purposes, while you have the power of levying only two shillings and four pence for the same purpose. It is, therefore, evident that this district would not be worse off in point of taxation by being annexed to the city. The other districts mentioned might have their taxes slightly increased, but they would get the benefit of gas-light, paving, sewerage, &c. In Liverpool,

463. There are not any of the footways of the thoroughfares leading to the Pembroke township that have been improved in that way?—Yes; the footways in Baggott-street have been improved, and are in perfect order until you reach the edge of the Pembroke township.

464. Mr. Heron.—Baggot-street has unquestionably been paved!—Yes; the narrow portion of it, where the traffic is great, has been paved in the most improved manner—with Welsh paving sets, "grouted" with tar. That is at a place called Morion-row.

Mr. PARKS NEVILLE, C.E., EXAMINED.

Manchester, and other cities, while the entire area within the municipal boundary contributes to the general expenses of carrying the Improvement Act into operation, the salaries of the officers, &c., yet, at the same time, each out-towmship pays only its own expenses with regard to the public work annually executed. By adopting this system the tax upon the rural districts would be but slightly increased."

472. With reference to the Pembroke and Rathmines townships their valuations now closely approach £100,000 per annum each?—Yes.

473. As regards the actual expenditure for building materials I presume that would represent for each an expenditure of between £700,000 and £800,000?—I should say so.

474. And people don't expect to get ten per cent for the money expended on building?—Of course there is a deduction on the land.

475. And you would say that £700,000 or £800,000 in each of the townships would represent the amount expended on building interests—about that sum?—I should say so.

476. Have not the whole of these materials to be carried through the streets of Dublin?—Yes, certainly; there is no other way.

477. My learned friend speaks of the advantages which those townships possessed. I presume one of these advantages is in not paying any taxation to be devoted towards the maintenance of the roads over which the building materials were carried?—Yes; when speaking of building materials I mean stone, bricks, timber, coal, iron, &c. &c.

478. I presume the furniture for the houses has also to be carried over the roads of the city out to the townships?—Of course that is the case with regard to the furniture for the houses; but in speaking of the building materials I should have exempted stone from consideration in that regard, and bricks, too, come partly from the Rushfordham district.

479. Mr. Walker.—And don't they come from the canal?—Yes; a good many come by way of the canal.

480. Mr. Heron.—In reference further to the justice of the townships being exempted from taxation, I presume you have been living in Dublin all your life, and know the city very well?—Yes.

481. Do you remember when Dame-street, Gardiner-street, Summerhill, Henrietta-street, Granville-street, and a number of other streets, especially on the northern side of Dublin, were all inhabited by, and were the residence of wealthy people?—They were chiefly.

482. As regards Dame-street, have you tried to ascertain whether there is any merchant or trader residing in Dame-street at all?—I cannot exactly say, but I think not, as far as my observation goes. I think they all live in the country, and keep their business houses solely for business purposes.

483. As regards Summerhill, Dorset-street, and Gardiner-street, are they in a similar manner deserted by the old residents?—Oh, they are deserted, altogether by the old residents, and are chiefly let in lodging-houses, some of them of a very poor class. As to Summerhill and Gardiner-street—portions of Gardiner-street—I remember those places when they were all occupied by the highest professional men, and I have

BERLIC.
April 2, 1879.
Mr. Parks
Neville, Q.C.

been in the houses there at that time. They are now, for a good part, lodging-houses.

484. You remember those houses when they were occupied by the highest professional and mercantile men—I do.

485. As regards Henrietta-street, I find that the valuation of Henrietta-street in 1853 was £3,382, and the valuation in 1878 is £1,042. Are you aware, without going through other figures, that as regards many other of those streets I have named there is a similar depreciation in the value of the property going on—I have no doubt about it. I may mention, in relation to Henrietta-street, that I was over a house in that street that was once the residence of a nobleman—I forgot the name of the nobleman just now—and I was taken over that house by Mr. Vance, who has bought it for a mere trifle, and has turned it into a lodging-house.

486. I have now got the figures with reference to the valuation of Bathmunes—I find that the valuation of Bathmunes in 1853 was £30,725, whereas the valuation of Bathmunes in 1878 is £16,063.—Yes, that is so.

487. In your opinion, and as a matter of fact, Mr. Neville, has the city been, as it were, moving towards the east?—It has; it has been moving towards the south east.

488. And the persons who resided in those decaying streets that I have mentioned to the north of the city, have those persons migrated, so to speak, to the townships?—To the townships chiefly; a large quantity of them has, of course, gone to Kingstown; but a large quantity has gone to the Pembroke and Bathmunes townships, and other places immediately adjacent to the city. The fact is so, as you know. For instance, take Lower Mount-street. It is a continuous street to Northumberland-road. When you go to Lower Baggot-street, and simply cross the bridge, the thoroughfare is continuous just in the same way. I live within 200 yards of the city boundary, but I am in the Pembroke township. Then in the case of Charlemont-street there is no line of demarcation; it is a continuous street. Richmond-street and O'Conor-street in the same way are the main road to Bathmunes; and then you come to Harold's-cross.

489. What is the present line separating the township of Bathmunes from the city?—This is quite an imaginary one.

490. The streets joining the city to the township are continuous?—Yes; they are continuous streets.

491. Showing that the place was, as it were, part of the same city?—Yes; just in the same way that you pass out of the city of London into the Strand—just in the same way that you pass out of the city of London proper into the metropolitan district.

492. In order to show that you have been paying attention to this subject, when after 1853 did you again report on the matter?—I referred to it in a report in 1858, and subsequent reports.

493. And have you been of opinion, from that time down to the present, that for all proper purposes an extension of the municipal boundary was required?—I have.

494. And have you now, for the purposes of this inquiry, made a report and prepared maps for the use of the Municipal Boundary Commissioners?—I have.

495. In reference to the extension of the municipal boundary which you propose, is there any point in that ground which you propose to take in more than two miles from the old municipal boundary?—No, with the exception of just a small bit. The great bulk is not. I have marked on the maps with which the Commissioners have been supplied an imaginary line of two miles all round. With the exception of those two little bits (pointing to the large map) every portion of the districts proposed to be added is within two miles of the present city boundary.

496. Dealing with the north of the city, I believe you are in favour of including Clontarf within the municipal district?—I am.

497. Why?—I think it should be annexed because it joins the city here (pointing to the map). I think it is contiguous to a certain degree, and I think it should come into the city, particularly when it is supplied with water.

498. Is it supplied with water from the city?—Yes.

499. And is it also supplied with gas from the city? Yes, by the Gas Company.

500. Is there any reason why it should not be included in the city?—My opinion is that it should be included, and in my report I suggested so.

501. From the practical and for other purposes?—Yes. There are a great many people living along the shore road and about the avenues running off it, and they use the city very largely. Of course, Clontarf cannot be compared with the big townships, but still, in my opinion, it should be brought in. The next township to Clontarf is Drumcondra township, which has only just been formed.

502. Both the Drumcondras and the Clontarf townships are connected by tramways with the city?—They are. A tramway, as you are aware, runs along the shore road (to which I have already alluded) through Clontarf to Dollymount, and that renders the rest of the keeping that road very small.

503. I find on the map, to the west of Drumcondra (the portion outside Grangegegan), one of the portions coloured yellow, which is not in a township. Will you state your reason for suggesting that that should be included in the city district?—Yes; I may mention that I have landed in a return of the constituency and the valuation of that portion. There is a regular boundary of a townland, and we supply a large portion of it with water.

504. Is that built upon?—Yes, largely; and it is being built upon now. There is a new avenue opened up there, and some buildings have been put up by the late Adelstan O'Rourke and others.

505. It would be a convenient thing to put that piece into the adjacent ward?—I think so. I would put it into the Aran-quay Ward.

506. Do you know the valuation of that bit?—I have already given it in a return to the Commissioners.

507. The next yellow bit is the portion near Dolphin's-barn. Why do you suggest that that should be included?—This, for the mere purpose of a scientific frontier, that I would suggest that that should be included. It would very conveniently go into one of the adjacent wards.

508. And there would be no difficulty in throwing that bit into one of the adjacent wards?—No.

509. We then come to Bathmunes.—We then come to the piece of Bathmunes called Terenure, which is a valuable portion of the district, and is largely built over.

510. Do you propose to throw that into Bathmunes?—I have not considered that question.

511. CHIEFBORN.—The place you are now referring to is what you have marked on the map as Roundtown?—Yes; the piece called Roundtown and Terenure.

512. Is not that, Mr. Neville, a portion of the district that they went in for in the Rathfarnham and Terenure Township Bill in Parliament the other day?—Yes, it is.

513. MR. HERON.—On the far side of Pembroke there is another piece—an extensive piece—coloured yellow?—Yes; that is a place called Milltown. This district here (pointing to the map) I suggested should be taken in because it is covered with buildings, and we supply a quantity of water there.

514. I presume that that is the very bit of value in the whole of the £10,000; that is more than half the value, I should say.—I have not got the figures before me, but I should say it is.

515. It is more than half the value.—I should say it is.

516. Why then do you consider that that piece should be put in; is it by reason of its being covered with buildings?—Partly because it is covered with

DUBLIN.
April 5, 1859.
—
Mr. F. G. F. Nettle, C.B.

buildings, and partly because it makes a more regular scientific boundary. We have our water mains there too. Our great mains through the country go through that district, and we have mains leading in different directions in that place.

517. Do you consider that the boundary should be by defined roads, and not running through fields?—These boundaries (pointing to the map) are all marked with a yellow line—bounded by Foster avenue on the one side, down to Danzicus-road on the other.

518. In reference to the maintenance of roads through the city of Dublin, is that done under your superintendence at present?—I am Chief Engineer, but it is done chiefly now under the Deputy Surveyor.

519. But you are the Chief Engineer?—Yes.

520. At present, as I am informed by the evidence, there are about eighty miles of macadamised roads!—I don't think that is the extent of them.

521. Are there not so many miles of macadamised roads as eighty?—Not so many.

522. How many miles of macadamised roads are there under the city control?—Between seventy-five and eighty miles of roads altogether, I should think, but I can make out no exact return of the quantity, if the Commissioners wish it.

523. Are you of opinion, with regard to the main thoroughfares of the city, that these roads should be paved in place of being macadamised?—I certainly am in favour of paving all roads and streets where there is very much heavy traffic, but I would not pave such a place as Mountjoy-square, for instance, but where heavy traffic is I would pave those thoroughfares.

524. At present are there funds to keep the roads of the city in proper condition?—There are not.

525. What is the deficiency, and in what respect?—The deficiency is in the improvement rate. The amount got from that rate is not sufficient to keep the city clean, and the scavenging is defective from want of money, and is becoming worse, and is more apparent every day on account of the difficulty there is in procuring depots for getting rid of the stuff. In former times, as in the cases of all other cities, there was waste ground and hollows convenient which could be made use of for depositing the city refuse; and the fact is that for the want of these depots we are bunged up. I have only just returned from England, and was in Manchester on Friday, and I found that the same thing exists there. They are now bunged up for the want of similar depots.

526. What would be necessary to be done in reference to these depots?—There are two ways of dealing with the question of depositing the refuse—either by carrying the refuse out to the strand, there by the tramway (pointing to the map)—but the way I think it will have to be done will be, probably, to bring it out by barges—and towing it out there (pointing to the map) and dropping it into the sea.

527. As regards the traffic of the city, the residents of the townships, of course, as we know, use the city largely!—Yes.

528. As regards the townships as distinguished from the business or through passenger traffic—as regards the carriage of goods to the townships, does not a ton of goods carried to either Pembroke or Rushmills cost more than a ton of goods carried from the quay to, say, Mc'Nally's, or any other place in the city?—Certainly.

529. And at present there is nothing contributed by the townships for the maintenance of the roads?—Nothing.

530. Have you made a calculation as to the expense of keeping the roads and scavenging the roads in proper condition?—How much more would you require at this moment to do it decently?—Well, for scavenging the city, I think it would require at least £5,000 a year more.

531. What do you consider is necessary to be got in the way of improved machinery. Should there be

steam rollers?—That is for macadamised roads, I think there should be a steam roller; I recommended that years ago.

532. What other improvements are there that are necessary, and that you cannot get for want of money?—I think the great improvement that is wanted is paving. I think that is the real economy in all streets, with the exception of the purely private ones.

533. Under your superintendence are you aware that sums have been spent recently on the permanent improvement of streets?—There was a loan of £50,000 got, and I think that is almost exhausted.

534. What was the £50,000 for?—Paving only. Then there was a large sum of money spent—the whole of the north and south quays that lie to the east of Castle-bridge, and in the vicinity of the Custom House, were paved by presentment, and that cost a sum of £13,621.

535. How much was spent on footways?—A large sum of money.

536. About £30,000, was it not?—I think not.

537. How much has been spent on footways?—£19,300 on asphaltic footpaths.

538. Do you know the amount of the cost of the new Cattle Market?—Yes; I built the Cattle Market. The total cost was between £33,000 and £34,000.

539. As regards the pavements, are they permanent improvements?—They are.

540. That is the paving of roadways?—Yes; in 1836 and 1837, I recommended the Corporation to adopt the paving of the leading streets—such as Grafton-street, Dame-street, Nassau-street—and a large number were paved on the Liverpool system. We brought over Liverpool workmen, as set paving was not known here then. Those sets are down in Dame-street, and the paving there has never been stirred, except for repairs, for twenty-two years. We took up the stones in George's-street—for that street was also paved at the same time—recently, when the tramway-line was being put down there.

541. But as to Dame-street, is it in a good condition?—Yes; well it wants to be taken up, and the stones turned, and the joints closed up. But I was saying that in George's-street the stones had to be taken up for the purpose of laying the tramway that now runs to Clonskeagh. Well, the Corporation arranged with the tramway company to take up the whole street and repave it; consequently, the old stones which had been down for twenty-two years were all taken up, and I was surprised to see the preservation they were in after the service they had done. If those stones laid at that time were taken up and turned, they would be worth twenty-five years more use, and that would make about fifty years as the life of those stones.

542. As regards the Cattle Market, you built that for £33,000?—The original contract was for £17,000 or £18,000, but several additions have been made since that to meet the wants of the market, and it stands now at about £23,000 or £24,000, I think.

543. Are there any slaughter-houses in the townships?—Do you mean abattoirs or slaughter-houses?

544. Yes—I should say not.

545. Are there any licensed slaughter-houses in the townships?—I don't know of my own knowledge.

546. There are no public abattoirs at present anywhere?—No.

547. Do you consider as regards the health of the city that the private slaughter-houses should be put an end to?—Certainly; there is no doubt at all about that. I reported on the subject and drew plans.

548. Is there any doubt about that?—Not the slightest.

549. Have plans for a public abattoir ever been prepared?—Yes; I drew plans for a public abattoir and made estimates, after making inquiries as to the system adopted in Glasgow, Edinburgh, and other places, and

also in Park. That was ten or twelve years ago, and I have been just inquiring again into the matter.

550. Is that a matter essential to the health of the city?—Certainly. I think nothing can be more abominable than the present system of slaughter-houses.

551. As regards the townships—they of course get their meat from the city?—I don't know exactly whether they get it altogether or not.

552. I want to know how they any licensed slaughter-houses or not in the townships?—I know there are slaughter-houses at the rear of butchers on the Finsbury-road and in Upper Bagot-street, but whether they are licensed or not I cannot say.

553. Have you paid attention to the recent changes in the mode of taxation in some of the towns of England—for example, Manchester?—Yes, I found in Manchester that there are five townships around Manchester, and that those were all kept separate up to 1875.

554. Give me the names of those five townships in order that we may trace them?—There were five townships around Manchester—not including Salford.

555. CHAIRMAN.—There were or *are*?—They are called townships—Cheetham is one, and then there is Beswick, Handsworth, Hulme, and Chorlton-on-Medlock.

556. Mr. Heron.—Up to 1875 had each of those townships struck its own rate?—It had.

557. And was there a separate rate for the city of Manchester?—There was.

558. Since that time have those six rates been consolidated?—Yes. Here in my hand are the accounts of the Manchester City Treasurer for 1877 and 1878, and in them you will find no mention of these individual townships, and up to 1875 they were all kept separate.

559. Since that time there has been one rate for the whole?—Yes.

560. CHAIRMAN.—Have you inquired how that change was made?—I cannot tell whether it was by Act of Parliament or otherwise; I think it was by Act of Parliament, but I am not certain. It is, however, right to mention that these townships always had some connection with the city—something like an electoral division of a union, and they paid some of the mayor's salary and also of the town clerk's salary, &c., &c.

561. But each had its own council?—Each had its own council and struck its own rate until the year I have named.

562. Mr. Heron.—Are you aware that there has been an extension of the municipal boundary of Liverpool?—I am aware that there has been an extension of the boundaries of Liverpool. In fact I think there has been an extension of the boundaries of Glasgow and in—

563. And in a good many other places?—Yes; a good many other places.

564. Since 1875 have they been carrying on great improvements in Manchester?—They are always improving there.

565. They have very good roads there?—Yes; the city of Manchester is entirely paved.

566. Are there any funds at present to enable you to have public statioons for the city of Dublin?—No, unless the money was borrowed under the new Public Health Act. It must be borrowed.

567. Is it your opinion that these townships should contribute by taxation to all these improvements of the city?—I think they ought to be brought into the city boundary; and that they should contribute towards them.

568. Of course it is a great advantage to them to be having improvements without having to contribute any taxation?—Yes.

569. Have you made any comparison as to the amount of taxation at present on the townships, and the amount on the city?—

CHAIRMAN.—Pardon me, Mr. Heron, it would

be very important with regard to these Manchester accounts to ascertain about this item. I just opened one of the pages casually, and I see there is put down "By contribution to City Fund in aid of the city rates." It would be very important to ascertain whether that item applies to one of these uniting districts.

Mr. Heron.—What is the amount?

CHAIRMAN.—£25,000. What it goes to I cannot say. It would be very well if some one connected with the Corporation would look into these accounts, and give us some idea how the amalgamation has taken place, or how the rates are settled or divided.

Mr. Norwood.—That shall be done.

Examination resumed.

570. Mr. Heron.—Besides abattoirs, is there any other great public work required, in your opinion? Is there anything else that should be done for a city like Dublin?—We want a general market, but that is going to be supplied by a public company.

571. Was it your opinion that the Corporation should have the supply of the gas of the city?—That was and is my opinion. Were it the case, I am quite certain that the citizens would be supplied with gas very much cheaper and better.

572. Do the Corporation supply the gas in Belfast?—They do, I think.

573. Do they supply it in Liverpool?—I know they do there.

574. And in Glasgow?—Yes.

575. And in Manchester?—Yes; the Corporation have supplied it in Manchester for many years. They spent about £400,000, the profit of the gas works, towards the construction of the new waterworks there; but it was subsequently found that they had not legally the power so to apply the money, and they were obliged to go to Parliament to get an indemnity on the ground of the mal-appropriation of these funds.

576. As regards the supply of gas in all these great cities by the Corporations of them, has it not been a perfect financial success?—It always has been, and I have heard, and I believe, it would be so here.

577. And an ease to the taxation of the town?—Yes, certainly.

578. I mean that the profit of supplying the gas has gone in ease of the public taxation of the town or city?—Well, I should say that the way the supplying of gas by the Corporation would benefit the city would be in the way of reducing the price of gas to the rate-payers and the cost of public lighting. I may mention that public baths and wash-houses are wanted very much in this city.

579. Mr. Heron.—Is there any extension of building required, in your opinion, for the Fire Brigade?—Yes, there is.

580. There should be two stations?—Yes; besides the present Fire Brigade station is a very inconvenient place. It is neither healthy nor wholesome, and where Captain Ingram resides and those men on the lookout are by no means desirable places. There should, in my opinion, be new stations built. The present principal station is at the old Assembly House in William-street.

581. There should be two stations built?—Yes; there should be one at the south side with a suitable residence for Captain Ingram, and with accommodation for the proper appliances. There should be a station on the north side with similar conveniences and appliances, and with suitable accommodation for one of the officers and ten or twelve men.

582. And with proper telegraphic communication between the two stations?—Yes.

583. And would you have the townships under one management as regards the Fire Brigade?—Certainly.

584. Do you think that essential to the safety of life and property?—I do. I have no doubt that the fire brigade system, if these townships were brought in, would be extended all round, and then that there

DERRIS.
49-II-a, 2679.
Mr. P. Heron
Norwich, c.m.

DUBLIN,
April 2, 1879.
Ms. Parke
Neville, c.s.

should be other out-lying stations in those districts, had communication with the central station by telegraph.

CHAIRMAN.—I observe that they have some sort of fire brigade establishment at Rathmines.

585. Mr. Horan (to witness).—Do you know anything about the Fire Brigade at Rathmines?—It is only a nominal one, I believe. There was a fire at the distillery at Hazel's-cross-bridge a couple of years ago, and the water was not available until the Dublin Fire Brigade went out there. They could not get the water up to the top of the building. I believe they could not fight with the fire at all. Captain Ingram can, however, tell you about that.

586. I find that "Labour at fire, £9 7s. 6d." was paid by the "National" and "Royal" Fire Insurance Companies.—They paid nothing to the Corporation.

Cross-examined by Mr. Walker, Q.C.

587. I suppose, Mr. Neville, you use a very large quantity of stones for the streets of Dublin?—Yes.

588. Where do you get them?—The best quality of them are got from the neighbourhood of Bohemakreecta—seven or eight miles from Dublin on the Tallaghtside.

589. The traffic of the earnings of those steams comes in through Rathmines?—It does.

590. And a great quantity of bricks is brought in by the canal?—The Tullamore bricks come in by the canal, and also the Athy bricks. The county Dublin bricks are brought by cart from the Rathfarnham district, and there is a large quantity of English bricks used, which must come up from the quay through the city to the townships.

591. When was it you borrowed the sum of £50,000?—It was about two years ago, I should think.

592. You say you would require about £5,000 a year more in order to do the scavenging of the city properly?—I am speaking roughly, but I should think so.

593. In point of fact, have the Corporation made any estimate as to what they are going to do with any sum of money they may get from the townships—have they formed any plan?—I made an estimate that we would require to pave the streets most wanting it.

594. Have you formed any plan as to the distribution of the sum as regards the townships?—I don't understand you.

595. You say you would require a large sum?—Yes.

596. Have you formed any plan as to how much of that would be levied on the townships, or how much of it would be levied on the city?—I have formed no plan of that kind.

597. You say there are certain civic works which are necessary, and you have mentioned the sum of £5,000. May I ask what are the civic works you refer to?—Abattoirs were one of them.

598. Public abattoirs?—Yes.

599. That was one of the objects of the Bill of 1877—the Improvement Bill?—It was.

600. And that Bill was thrown out?—It was not thrown out. It fell through on standing orders, and that is a different thing altogether.

601. However, you didn't get it. As regards the general market, of course you are aware that there is a company formed within the city for the purpose of providing a general market?—I am aware of that.

602. And that company carried their bill in spite of the opposition of the Corporation?—I don't think the Corporation opposed it. They appeared to get certain clauses inserted in the Bill to protect their rights as clerks of the markets, and also to protect their licensing powers.

603. As regards the gas, the Corporation promoted a Bill for that purpose and failed?—They did.

604. And as regards the baths and wash-houses that was part of the Bill of 1877 also?—It was.

605. Have you made any inquiry as regards these townships that surround Manchester as to what were the circumstances under which they were annexed, or

whether they were annexed at all?—They were annexed, but they had rating powers, they formed little circles of their own, each circle contributing to the centre.

606. The map that you have produced here of Manchester is nearly a tourist's map?—Yes, merely a trifling map.

607. Who is the Town Clerk there?—Sir Joseph Horan.

608. Have you been in communication with him?—Not recently, but I have been. I have been in communication with the City Treasurer of Manchester, and he gave me three books of their city accounts, and called my attention to the fact that up to 1875 there were separate rating powers for each of the townships.

609. CHAIRMAN.—And what has been the case since that year?—Since that time the Corporation make the rate a uniform rate for the whole. Formerly Chester could levy 6d., Berwick 5d., Hardwick 4d., and so on. Now the central authority makes it 1s. or 8d. over the entire.

610. I understand you to say that now they have power still to strike their own rate, but with a contribution to the centre authority?—That was the old system, I think.

611. And now that they are amalgamated the centre strikes a rate of 6d. or 1s., and strikes the same rate over the extended area?—It strikes the same rate over the whole. One shilling, 8d., or 10d., or whatever it is, it is extended over Manchester proper and the five townships I have named. I will ascertain for you by return of post the exact information you require.

612. We would also be glad to know what was done in that case with regard to the debts—how the debts were arranged?—That shall be ascertained for you.

613. Could you give me an idea of the extent of the roads in Rathmines and Rathgar that are under the care of the Town Commissioners?—I think you would get that better from the Town Commissioners themselves, but I did get a rough approximation. I make, in round figures, twenty-four miles to be the extent of the roads in Rathmines.

614. I see in the account for the year ending the 15th of June, 1875, that the entire put down as sanitary expenditure—it is in five items—the amount put down is £237 8s. 6d. That is, as I have said, made up of five items. Certainly their sewerage works are very little. The items are—

"Salaries, £77 10s. 5; sewerage, £43 7s.; Public Works Loan Commissioners (interest on loan), £108 11s. 4d.; H. Hamond, esq., inspection and report on water supply, £22 10s.; incidental expense and printing, 43 8s. 1d.—£237 8s. 6d."

So that the entire paid for sewerage works, that year charged, is £43 7s.

615. Suppose this district is extended, as is sought, would there be a saving to the townships themselves in the engineering department—that is, if they were brought into the parent city?—I think there would. I look upon the tramway now, with regard to Rathmines especially, as a very important element in the consideration of the question. The great leading roads on which the heavy traffic was borne bore now a double line of tramway, the effect of which is that it relieves that township of the great bulk of the repairing. I may mention, as a matter of fact, that Mr. Stokes, the late chairman of the Rathmines Commissioners, told me himself that if it wasn't for the tramways they would have been obliged to shut up, or they would have been obliged to go in for additional rating powers.

616. With regard to the water-pipes in all these townships, where did they bring them from—were they brought through the streets of Dublin, or how were they brought to them?—I think they were landed on the quays. It would be easier to cart them there from Kingstown.

617. I find in the Rathmines accounts an item, "coals for engine and cost of gas for engine"?—They have a pumping engine in Rathmines. That is the explanation of that item.

618. The cost for engine and gas cost £258 12s. 2d. That comes under the head of waterworks. Then, of course, that coal must have all been carted through the streets of Dublin!—Of course it must.

619. Was there ever any calculation made as to the amount of coal that has been carted year by year to these different townships through the streets of Dublin!—I don't know.

620. As compared with that carted to the inhabitants of the city alone—could that be ascertained!—I am afraid that could not be ascertained.

621. Mr. Heron.—How much would be the average of a house?

Mr. Neville.—That could never be ascertained unless by an approximation.

622. CHAIRMAN.—I don't think that it is altogether impossible. We could get, I should think, an approximation of the amount of coal used in each house. It is one of the principal things that wears out the streets—the carriage of coal!—Yes; and they have got light drays now to carry the coal on, and you will see the drivers of those drays, whenever they get the slightest chance, running at the rate of five miles an hour, and the greater the speed at which vehicles pass over a road the greater the wear.

623. Of course the carriage of corn from the quays to the breweries and distilleries, and all that sort of thing, is a very important source of wear on the streets!—Yes; but the breweries and distilleries are chiefly within the city boundary as at present defined.

624. But then the Greenmount Distillery is just outside that boundary!—Yes, it is just outside the boundary.

625. Then there is the Chapelizod distillery!—Yes, the Chapelizod distillery does a great deal of mischief. In connection with that distillery there is a long carriage through the city and along the O'Conor-Quinn-road, and that entails a very serious loss to the city.

626. Did you ever go into a calculation as regards this? Suppose the Rathmines township was not there, would the funds you now have at your disposal be sufficient to keep up the roads and the sanitary matters of the city? Have you made any calculation of the amount of wear and tear that is put on your streets by their being used so heavily as they are by these suburban districts, as contrasted with the wear and tear of your own people in the city proper!—I have not.

627. Would you make the calculation at one-half? Now you suggest taking in the townships; do you think they make as much use of the streets of Dublin in the way of carriage and driving over them in every way—do they make as much use of the streets as the people of the city!—I should say, making a very inaccurate guess, it would be about one-half—at least that, because if you take the population and the number of houses, I think altogether there are about 24,000 houses in Dublin.

628. If you take it that way it would; but it might not be fair. Recollect the people living in this district have to cart from the extremity of their side (pointing to map), and they would cart less than a man who got a ton of coal to Westmoreland-street!—It would require, in order to arrive at anything like a correct idea, a series of long observations, but I do not think you would be very far astray in, at all events, saying one-half. There is, however, no definite data. I mean that the streets of Dublin would cost fifty per cent. less if the townships were not there, but if the subtraction is granted the cost would be still very large over the extended district, because the macadamised streets, in my opinion, suffer most.

629. Your view, then, with regard to the £50,000 you have borrowed for paving is that an expenditure of one-half of that becomes a necessity by the use of your former macadamised streets by the people who reside in the townships!—As I said before, that is the case as far as can be approximated. In any case their traffic on the city streets must be very considerable.

630. Would the cost of looking after the townships and of repairing the roads, &c.,—would that be likely to be increased or lessened by the proposed extension?—Of which roads?

631. Of the roads through the townships, if added to Rathmines—I should say that most of the townships. It does not so much apply to Pembroke; but the other townships have certainly been relieved to a most extraordinary extent by the tramways, and the roads that now remain are private roads, that require a very small amount of money to keep them up, and to maintain them, because they are used merely for the traffic of the houses of the people who live in them.

632. Don't the streets of Dublin proper also get a great benefit from the tramways!—They have got a very large amount of benefit.

633. Then the benefit they get from the tramways,—these people outside—the benefits they get are that they are brought into the city by the tramways, and they are able to use the streets of the city, and so on?—Of course they are.

634. You were asked about using the roads of the townships for the carriage of the stone to the city. Is the traffic on those roads anything equal to that which is carried on over your roads in the city!—I should think not anything like it. 11,052 was the number of tons of green stone drawn from the district to which I have already referred, in 1877. That is the last return I have got.

635. Mr. Corriss.—That all goes through Rathmines!—That comes from Terenure now chiefly along the tramway line, and some comes to town along the Harold's-cross-road, which has now a tramway line too, so that, as a matter of fact, all that stone, as far as the Rathmines township is concerned, is carried along the tramway road.

636. Mr. Walker.—Does that include the building-stone?—No; that is only the sandstone from Ballynahinch.

637. CHAIRMAN.—You spoke of the extension of the boundaries at Liverpool. Did you make any inquiry about them as to the taking in of the townships!—I know, as a matter of fact, that they have been taken in, but I cannot give you any further information than that there have been some taken in for such a long time. They were going for some further extension, I was told, this present session. I don't know, however, whether they carried it or not.

638. You gave me an account of the cost of the repairing, and I understood you to say that about one-half of the present cost was put on you!—Yes, but I gave that answer reservedly. I should say from one-third to one-half.

639. Would you say that the scavenging was in the same proportion!—I would desire to read, in regard to the scavenging, an extract from a report which I made up to December of last year. In that report I state—

"That the scavenging of the city is not efficient there can be no doubt, and it is equally certain that the present state of things cannot be remedied without a much larger expenditure than can be at present allocated to it, and I beg to refer to my Report, dated May 2nd, 1877, annexed, and which goes fully into the question, and gives the cost of this work in Liverpool, Manchester, Glasgow, Birmingham, and other cities. I also give evidence on this question in May, 1876, before the special Parliamentary Committee appointed to inquire into the Local Government and Taxation of Towns in Ireland when I gave the following calculations, based on facts—During the last six years of the late Paving Board their Commissioners expended about £111,000 per annum upon the sweeping and watering of a length of streets of about 56 miles in their charge. The Corporation during the three years ending 1875 have expended on average of £15,513. This sum is £4,700 per annum in excess of that of the above Board, but when this is considered in relation to the enormous increase which has taken place between the two periods in labour and materials, it is really £1,500 less, and if to this is estimated an increased length of streets, to be swept and watered by the Corporation, of 110 as compared with 88, it is really about £8,300 less, as if we take the increase of labour and materials at 75 per cent. (which is under the mark), we have 100 : 75 :: 11,000,

DEBATE.
April 8, 1878.
Mr. Fiske
Sands, c.c.

DUBLIN,
April 5, 1885.
Mr. Park
Scribd, C.B.

£18,250 is the sum that ought to have been expended without taking into consideration the increased length of streets in charge of the Corporation, and supposing this was taken into account, and that it required the same cost as the other portions, the expenditure should be £24,000 per annum.¹ [The Corporation and the Committee do their best, but they have not the funds to carry out the works they are charged with.]

I shall be happy to furnish you with a copy of that Report. It was printed in answer to an article in the *Times* newspaper. Therefore, you see I am entirely under the mark when I say £5,000 or £6,000 more would be required annually.

640. You said that one of the advantages of annexation would be the abolition of these private slaughter-houses and the creation of one abattoir; can you tell me, in Manchester does one abattoir suffice for the five townships you have mentioned, and Salford, or have they one in each district?—In Manchester they have one slaughter-house belonging to the Corporation, which is chiefly for what is called the wholesale trade, and there are private slaughter-houses. The slaughter-houses devoted to the wholesale trade is for butchers who are in a comparatively small way of trade, and who do not keep slaughter-houses, and they go into that public slaughter-houses and buy a carcass or half a carcass, and that sort of thing. That is the way in which the public slaughter-houses is used in Manchester.

641. What would be your proposal, or the proposal of the Corporation, supposing that the townships or any portion of them were brought into the Dublin Municipal area?¹ Would your proposition be that there should be one abattoir for the entire extended area?—If the townships are brought in I think there should be more than one abattoir—probably one between Rathmines and Pembroke, and another on the north side. In Edinburgh there is only one for the whole city.

642. Your idea would be to have one between Rathmines and Pembroke, and only one for the city?—There might be, probably, more. In Glasgow there are three. In both Glasgow and Edinburgh there are no cattle allowed to be slaughtered anywhere else, and there is a penalty attached to slaughtering cattle outside these public slaughter-houses, and that is, in my opinion, the only proper and true system.

643. By the accounts of the Corporation for either this year or last year the sewer rate is only 2d., whereas it had been for the three preceding years 4d. How is it that the sewer rate this year is so much less?—Formerly the sewage was excluded out of the sewer rate, that is, there was no money borrowed. There was, generally speaking, £3,000 or £4,000 each year—something over £4,000 each year, which was spent upon new sewers, and the repairing of old ones. That has been carried on up to last year. Then the Corporation decided on borrowing £35,000 to finish off all the sewers at once, so that instead of spending £4,000 on works they had only to pay the interest on £35,000, and that reduced the rate in that way.

Mr. Thomas
O'Donnell

MR. THOMAS O'DONNELL examined.

647. Mr. Norwood.—You fill the office of City Accountant?—Yes.

648. And have done so for some years?—For eight years.

649. Will you produce the accounts of the city—we had better take the last year, 1877-1878, of which the Commissioners have got a copy in their hands?—Yes.

650. Take those accounts, and make to the Commissioners what is the total debt chargeable upon the city for all purposes?—The total, as set forth here in the account, is £206,834 13s. 10d.

651. I see you have divided this in the account into "City Estate Liabilities," "Improvement Fund Liabilities," "Bonds of Indebtedness," and "Waterworks Fund Liabilities"?—Yes.

644. Mr. Corcoran.—That was a rate of only 2d. for repairs?—Yes; for repairs and maintenance.

645. And will it continue at 2d.?—Yes; it will continue at that, to pay the interest on the £35,000, and then there are the repairs and the maintenance.

646. CHAIRMAN.—That will be about £4,000?—Yes, about £4,000.

647. Mr. Corcoran.—What was the principle that guided the framers of the Metropolitan Police Boundary?—I have no idea; it is a very strange boundary; it goes across fields.

648. It goes through Grangegorman and goes through an agricultural district?—I had a great deal of trouble to get it. I got it from the Commissioners of Police.

649. Was it ever proposed to be altered?—I never heard.

Dr. Norwood.—It was originally made under the 1st and 2nd of the Queen, and then it was altered subsequently. In 1850, when under the provisions of the 1st and 2nd of the Queen, which regulated the police district of the Dublin Metropolis which gave power to the Lord Lieutenant by Order in Council to subdivide or redivide the district, and it was under that Act of Parliament it was that this Order, which I had before the Commissioners, was got, and you will see how irregular the boundary is.

[Document handed in. Appendix No. 5.]

650. Mr. Heron.—Is Dublin practically built upon to the full extent of the present municipal boundary?—Practically I may say it is. There has been, however, a class of small houses built lately which has filled up a good deal of the vacant building ground. Such places I refer to as what is called Hone's Rule terrace, and other such places built in the vicinity of the Mater Misericordiae Hospital, and other places again along the South Circular-road, and also Mr. Stokes built over site of old Phoenix Park. The class of buildings now built—those to which I have referred—are much inferior and of a small class, and are generally occupied by people who formerly lived in lodgings, or by the better class of tradespeople.

651. You know, of course, the main roads running out to the Pembroke and Rathmines townships and to Harold's-cross?—Yes, I do.

652. Has there been recently, as regards the borrowing of the money already spoken of, a considerable expenditure on the main arteries leading out to the townships?—Do you mean within the city?

653. Yes.—Yes. The tramways have been paved, as I have said before, all up Richmond-street and up Harold's-cross, and up Clerkenwell-street and even Baggot-street. I suppose that is what you refer to.

654. CHAIRMAN.—But they only pave half way across?—Eighteen feet of the way.

655. And you have to do the rest?—Yes. It is intended to pave all these streets.

656. Are all these streets to be paved with the money you borrowed?—There is an application to Parliament for £100,000, and there is an estimate that £250,000 will be wanted.

657. Will you state the total under each heading, taking first the heading of "City Estate Liabilities"?—The total amount is £195,804 13s. 1d. That is made up of £31,523 1s. 1d.—"Temporary Indebtedness to other Funds"—It is made up of "Balance of old Debenture Debt (Irish currency)," £163,276 18s. 1d. in British money, and of £24,000, "Debenture Debt (British currency)," and is a charge of £1,000 on account of advance for the "Artisans' Dwellings Improvement."

658. Just for a few moments let us deal with the separate items. "The amount of Borough Fund Indebtedness to other Funds"—please explain that—it is simply money that has been borrowed from other funds to meet Borough Fund Liabilities when the Borough Fund revenue was not available.

664. In order to prevent the necessity for going into the market, whatever funds were in credit you took so much from them in order to obtain that temporary amount?—Yes, just so.

665. I observe, from the terms which have fallen from you of British and Irish currency, that some of the debts are of old date?—Yes. In fact, the whole of the Borough Fund indebtedness, with the exception of that temporary loan and the Dwelling-houses Improvement Fund, is all old indebtedness.

666. Are you aware whether those debts were contracted antecedently or subsequently to the Municipal Reform Corporations Act coming into operation?—Oh, they were contracted antecedently to the passing of the Reformed Corporations Act. The debt was much larger than it is now. The total debt charged upon the city estate in 1841 was £268,035 18s. 1d.

667. The city estate owed that?—Yes, it owed £268,035 18s. 1d. on the 1st of November, 1841. (Appendix No. 6.)

668. In what year?—When the Reformed Corporation came in.

669. CHAIRMAN.—Then you have paid the difference?—Yes.

670. Dr. Norwood.—Would you please state the difference paid off in money?—That debt was made by the Town Council by the issue of debentures in 1819—£236,400 Irish currency, equivalent in British money to £190,525 ls. dd.; and debentures were issued on the 5th of October, 1832, amounting in British currency to £50,000. Tontine liability and other debts, £47,512 16s. 7d.

671. And the difference has been paid off?—Yes.

672. Do you know at what rate that difference has been paid off per annum?—Yes. Well, it has been paid off at different periods, but the £30,000 debt, British currency, has been paid off at the rate of £500 per annum.

673. Under the deed of trust dated in 1819?—No, no.

674. Are not those debentures retired under the provisions of that deed?—They are retired under the provisions of a deed to the Hibernian Bank.

675. As far as the present Corporation are concerned they have not added to the city estate liabilities, except as to that small temporary indebtedness and the artisans' Dwelling Loan?—They have not.

676. CHAIRMAN.—No. Because including everything they have reduced the debt £70,000?—Yes; nearly.

677. Dr. Norwood.—What is the city estate—please state of what does it consist?—It is composed of the rents from the property, and also the proceeds of the slippage and anchorage dues; and sundry small rents in the way of fees and fines, and not real estate, may be taken. In round numbers the rental amounts to £18,000 per annum.

678. CHAIRMAN.—Where is that shown on the accounts?—It is at page 54, at the head, and No. 4, at foot of the page.

679. That is the present amount of the income?—Yes.

680. That is the paid rental?—Yes.

681. Dr. Norwood.—We heard yesterday of a probable increase in the city income from terminable leases falling in within the next year or two. What addition would that give to the rental?—Well, I could not take it upon myself to offer an opinion. I cannot say.

682. What is the estimate?—I cannot say.

683. Has it been estimated?—I believe it has, but the City Treasurer will be able to give evidence upon that point.

684. Have you given the pages in the account upon which these several items are set forth and explained?—Yes.

685. Now, let us come to the next item—"The Improvement Fund Liabilities." What are those liabilities?—The first item brought out is £34,500, money that was borrowed for the purpose of a market—for the purpose of making the Cattle Market,

The next item is £400, balance due the Bank of Ireland, on account of £2,000 advanced for the improvement of College-green.

686. That was for the erection of the College railings?—Yes.

687. And was the residue paid off?—Yes; and £18,000 represents the balance of a sum of £50,000, borrowed from the Law Life Assurance Society for special paving work.

688. That is the £50,000 of which we have been hearing yesterday and to-day?—Yes.

689. At what rate is that loan being paid off?—The twentieth portion every year.

690. That is under an Act of Parliament?—Yes.

691. And the Act of Parliament provides that in the case of a sum borrowed on the security of the Improvement Fund, a twentieth portion was to be paid off annually?—Yes, either that or that a sinking fund must be provided.

692. Thus £48,000—how is the difference made up?—In this way, that we have paid £2,000 under the statute, which represents two years' instalments.

693. You are paying that also by instalments?—Certainly, because we are bound to do so by our agreement with the Company. We have got it in two instalments—an instalment of £20,000 and a second instalment of £30,000; and we are, therefore, obliged to pay £1,000 a year of the £20,000, or rather £1,500 of the £30,000.

694. With regard to the Cattle Market loan, I see there is a sum of £17,000. Does that represent the whole sum borrowed on foot of the Cattle Market Department?—Not at all; that £17,000 represents the amount advanced by the original subscribers to the Cattle Market, and £550 represents the amount advanced by Mr. Maude, and £3,500 was issued as mortgage at four and a half per cent. for Cattle Market purposes and £8,500 on mortgages, numbers 200 to 234 inclusive, at six per cent., payable out of the profits of the market.

695. Those debts are in process of gradual liquidation?—They are not.

696. CHAIRMAN.—They amount in all to £24,550. Are they reducible every year?—They ought to be paid, but none has been paid off yet.

697. Because you had not the funds?—For that reason—because the subscribers to the market took bonds from the Corporation which were to run for fifty years.

698. Have you any power to pay them off?—Oh, yes, by calling them in.

699. You are paying six per cent. for the money?—Yes, out of the profits of the market—that is, if the profits of the market admitted of the payment of it.

700. Dr. Norwood.—Strictly speaking, under the statute, they should have allocated a twentieth part under the section of the statute, but it was not done, because they were, as I understand, extending and improving the Cattle Market, and that has been newly completed for the use of the subscribers. (To witness)—Have you gone through the entire of the Improvement Fund Debts?—The amount due on account of money borrowed under their borrowing powers under the 12th & 13th of Victoria, chapter 97, section 24. The amount remaining due on the 31st of August, 1878, was £72,050 out of a sum of £78,050, borrowed out of a sum of £100,000.

701. CHAIRMAN.—How much of that are you bound to pay off every year?—We are bound by Act of Parliament to pay off a twentieth portion of it.

702. But then you have not done it?—We have not done it with respect to the Cattle Market Loan; we have paid none of it. With respect to the rest of debt, we have.

703. Dr. Norwood.—Carried out the provisions of the statute?—Certainly.

704. CHAIRMAN.—How long have you borrowed that, because you have only paid £1,000, and you should

Dr. Norwood
April 6, 1878.

Mr. Thomas O'Donnell

Debates.
April 5, 1878.
Mr Thomas
O'Donnell

have paid £1,500 on the other!—There is £2,000 set down as—

705. It should not be £48,000, as due!—No, £48,000 was due on the 31st of August, but on account of other loans which do not appear here we have paid £1,000 to the National Bank, on account of money borrowed for the purpose of—

706. How long is it since you borrowed that £1,000 and that £30,000?—We borrowed the £18,000 three years ago, being the balance of £20,000.

707. If you did, that should have been reduced by £1,000 a year!—So it is now. This account is only made out up to August, 1878, and since this account was made up we have paid £1,000 more.

708. Then how does it stand now!—The debt on account of the first instalment of £20,000 at the present moment is £17,000.

709. Mr. CORRIGAN.—With reference to mortgages 233 and 235, when were they got?—In November, 1875, and in February, 1878.

710. CHAIRMAN.—If you were bound to pay off £1,000 a year, and you only borrowed £20,000 three years ago last November, then you should have paid off £3,000!—So we have. This account with which you are now dealing was only made up to the 31st of August, 1878.

711. What do you owe now. Then you owe £20,000 less three instalments of £1,000 each!—So we do. I will give you an account of how we stand at present,

712. That would be the best. Would you, Mr. O'Donnell give us the sum owing on these three mortgages?—Yes.

713. Dr. NORWOOD.—Before you go into that, let me ask you, as far as the account closing on the 31st of August, 1878, is concerned, does the schedule show the entire indebtedness of the Corporation on all funds whatever?—Certainly, on account of loans.

714. On loans, money borrowed, and so on!—Yes, but not on account of current account.

715. It shows a true representation of the condition of the Corporation?—Yes, I have got a statement made up to the 3rd of April, 1879, showing the existing indebtedness for loans at that date. (Appendix No. 7.)

716. CHAIRMAN.—How much do you owe on that mortgage, 235?—On mortgage 235 we owe £17,000.

717. Dr. NORWOOD.—Would you now take and tell the Commissioners what is actually owing under the head of City Estate Liabilities?

CHAIRMAN.—He has already explained that.
WITNESS.—But we have reduced it since.

718. Dr. NORWOOD.—Let us have the City Estate Liabilities!—The total amount due by the Borough Fund on the City Estate Account on the 3rd of April was £204,774 17s. 8d. I can account for that in this way—There was due on account of Original Debenture Loans, issued in 1818, £168,276 18s. 5d., and on account of £30,000 Debenture Loan there was £33,390 due. But we increased our indebtedness since the 31st of August, 1878, by the sum of £12,000, being instalments for Artisans' Dwellings, making the debt under that head £12,997 19s.

719. How much was expended?—£690 s.

720. And that indebtedness was incurred under the Artisans' Dwellings Act?—Yes, the 38th & 39th of Victoria, chapter 96.

721. CHAIRMAN.—As we are on that, that £6,528 ls. 4d., was that paid off?—Portion of it was paid off, but we did not include that in our statement of loans, because it comes under the head of temporary indebtedness. It is not what we call statutable liabilities.

722. Now let us have the others!—There are the Cattle Market bonds; the bonds issued to the subscribers to the Cattle Market, £17,000; the balance remaining due on that is £17,000; then there is the £550 to Meade, and the balance remaining due on that is £550; then there is mortgage 120, £3,500, and the balance remaining due on that is £3,500;

then there is the mortgage issued to the National Bank for £2,000, and there is no balance due on account of that, the £2,000 having been paid off. Likewise of the £2,000 from the Bank of Ireland, we have paid off £1,500, leaving £500 due of course. Then on account of the £30,000 from the Life Assurance Co., we owe £17,000, £3,000 of that having been paid; and on account of the £30,000 we have paid £1,500, leaving a balance of £18,500.

723. That was off the mortgage issued to—Off the first or second?

724. The second!—The second mortgage was issued a year from last February.

725. Therefore you have paid the one instalment of £1,500?—Yes.

726. Dr. NORWOOD.—Now give the total on foot of that!—The total remaining due out of a sum of £78,550, borrowed out of £100,000, is £50,550; and we have paid off £8,500.

727. And you have paid off since the close of the accounts of 1878, £2,930 in rated numbers?—Yes.

728. Now come to these "Bonds of Indebtedness"?—Those were issued for work done, and amount to £9,570 17s. 4d.

729. And how are they payable?—They are payable at different periods.

730. Have you paid any since the last account?—We have paid off Bond 51, £200. (Appendix No. 7.)

731. It would be better that you should give the figures, because they close the account to the same date. Will you explain, Mr. O'Donnell, for what works those Bonds of Indebtedness were issued?—They were issued to the Limmer Asphalt Company.

732. For what purpose?—For asphalting Henry-street and other places throughout the city.

733. They were expended in improving the city at all events?—Yes.

734. We will have from you the amounts spent upon foot of that head, up to the present date, by-and-bye. Now take the Waterworks Fund Liabilities, up to the present date!—Up to the present date?

735. Yes, up to the 3rd of April!—The total amount remaining due on the 3rd of April, 1879, on account of £30,400, borrowed out of a sum of £550,000, authorised to be raised under the Waterworks Act, was £302,872 9s. 4d.; added to that there is an old debenture debt of £72,013 7s. 8d., making the total indebtedness of the Waterworks funds for loans amount to £374,887 17s.

736. Then practically you have paid off, since the accounts for 1878 were closed, about £11,000?—Yes. I can give you the particulars of these loans, and the actual amounts remaining due. We paid the Government on account of terminable annuity £40,897 10s. 8d.

737. CHAIRMAN.—We have it now that the loan stands at £374,887 17s. 4d.—Yes.

738. And we know now what the loan originally was and what it stands at present?—Yes. £374,887 17s. is the correct amount.

739. Dr. NORWOOD.—Do you say that the amount of the old pipe water debenture debt is £72,000?—I do. £72,013 7s. 8d.

740. Is that in process of liquidation?—No.

741. Will you explain about that?—It was a debt incurred by the old Corporation for the purpose of a metal main and for building basins; and by the Waterworks Act of 1891 it was made a first charge upon the City Water Rate.

742. What is the annual instalment upon foot of terminable annuity?—We pay it half yearly; it is £19,100 per annum—£9,550 half yearly.

743. Does that £19,000 odd cover all the measures necessary to liquidate this old debenture debt also?—No; it simply covers the money advanced by Government by way of terminable annuity.

744. Of course you have power to pay it off if you like?—Yes; we can go into the market and buy it up.

745. How soon will the terminable annuity be wiped out?—We will wipe it out at the rate of £19,100 per annum, in about thirty years from the present time.

746. You have, of course, the accounts going back since 1861; what is the annual average income, under the head of income from the waterworks department?—I should refer to the accounts in order to give you those figures.

747. Well, about how much?—Well it has been increasing annually, I should say, for a period extending over four or five years, at the rate of about £1,000 a year. I should say that has been about the rate of the increase.

748. Partly on valuation and partly on contract?—Partly on improved valuation and partly on contract, *i.e.*

749. CHAIRMAN.—We will take the years, say for 1874–1875?—The amount judged by the Collector-General as produced by the rates—that is for the year ended the 31st of August, 1875—may be taken as £47,000 in round figures. (Appendix No. 8.)

750. Dr. Norwood.—In taking that you are comparing like things with like—taking the same items as extant in the income of 1878?—I am taking the judgments of the Collector-General as the basis for each.

751. Now, in 1876?—In 1876 it was £49,348 *ls.* *ld.* I wish to correct myself with respect to 1875. In 1875 it was £50,198 *ls.* *ld.*, because there was a deduction which I, in the first instance, lost sight of. In 1877 it was £51,018 *13s.* *2d.*; and in 1878 it was £52,521 *3s.* *9d.*

752. Will you explain the cause, if you know it, of the difference between the £50,000 and the £49,000?—You mean the £49,348—the income of 1876, as compared with that of 1875?

753. That is between 1875 and 1876—one is, in round numbers, £50,000, and the next one is £49,348—what is the cause of the decrease?—The cause was arrears outstanding and uncollected.

754. But practically the income is increasing at the rate of £1,000 a year?—It is, and more.

755. Do you know what portion of that the townships contributed for 1875?—The extra unsupplied district contributed £5,481 *15s.*; then under the head of meter-rate there is a sum of £13,129 *8s.* *6d.*

756. CHAIRMAN.—But that is for two years?—Yes; but then it is collected in the one year.

757. How is that?—We collect every year, but we collect an account of the arrears of other years in the one year.

758. Dr. Norwood.—With regard to that question of arrears, are there any extra water-rates levied from certain townships—that is for water supplied to them extra the statutable quantity allowed?—That is for excess water-rate.

759. What is the amount of excess water-rate?—In the case of the Pembroke township for the year ended December, 1878, it was over £500.

760. Is that the average?—Well, I cannot say.

761. And that is in addition to the statutable payment of 3*d.*; I believe that is the amount for Penrhos?—Yes.

762. They pay for excess water-rate £500 a year?—They were charged with that amount for the year ended December, 1878; they were in fact charged £510.

763. It is necessary you should state to the Commissioners what other amount was received?—There has been no other amount received. Bothvalines did not take water from us.

764. Well, as to Kilmainham?—No, there was no extra. I have mentioned the only instance supplied to me in which an excess supply was charged for.

765. CHAIRMAN.—And they paid you the sum you have named?—No, they are charged with it.

766. Dr. Norwood.—Does Drumcondra pay an excess rate?—There are only certain institutions within Drumcondra that pay us for water. I got this

return from the Secretary of the Waterworks Committee. The township I have already mentioned, Pembroke, is the only one that comes within the scope of this inquiry, that is chargeable with an excess for water supply.

767. CHAIRMAN.—Can we get a return for Clontarf, if there is any excess water charged for in that township?—If there is any charged for, we can get the return of once from the Waterworks Department.

768. CHAIRMAN (to witness).—Do the figures you have given us exhaust the entire debt?—Yes; what I have given you exhausts the entire debt. The entire debt upon the 3rd of April, 1879, an account of loans, was £80,012 *14s.* *3d.*

769. Mr. Corcoran.—Is that the corresponding item to the one on page 223?—Yes; excluding temporary loan indebtedness, and excluding indebtedness on Lloyd's Bonds. It is simply the amount due on account of loans.

770. Excluding Lloyd's Bonds altogether?—Yes; and excluding temporary loan indebtedness.

771. CHAIRMAN.—That would be no reduction at all?—Yes, because we borrowed £12,000 for the Artisan's Dwellings scheme.

772. Dr. Norwood.—That is under the new statute?—Yes.

773. What was the amount of the Borough Fund indebtedness to other funds on the 3rd of April?—On the 3rd of April it was about £4,628 *1s.* *1d.*

774. Then you have paid off how much?—About £9,000.

775. Is it not a fact that in the early months of the year certain of these funds are in less credit than towards the close of the year when the rates have been collected?—Yes, of course; but not on account of the use of the money of those funds.

776. They are only put in process of collection on the 1st of January?—The current year's assessment won't begin to come in well until the end of August.

777. CHAIRMAN.—The Collector-General cannot collect quick enough to put you in funds, therefore you are obliged to borrow from other funds—temporarily I mean—that are better circumstanced at the time you want the money?—Yes.

778. Dr. Norwood.—Does Drumcondra get water from you, and to what extent, if it does?—I don't think they got water at present from us. The Secretary of the Waterworks Committee will give you information on that subject. I think there is some arrangement pending between the Town Commissioners of Drumcondra and the Corporation as to a supply.

779. The pipes of the Corporation are laid down through the township, and they supply certain institutions within that township?—Those institutions are supplied by the Corporation, and not by the township.

780. By a direct contract between the proprietors of these institutions and the Corporation?—Quite so; and the books of the Waterworks Department would show the amount we receive from each of those institutions.

781. With regard to the rating powers of the Corporation, of course with the City Estate Liabilities, the rents comprising the Borough Fund were applicable to the liquidation of these?—Yes.

782. We will now come to the income. It commences at page 88, at the top. Now with regard to the income to meet that debt. Upon what page is the summary of your gross receipts?—You will get them on page 223. You will get there the abstract of the accounts.

783. Now just go through that in a similar way to the way in which you went through the others. With regard to the City Estate, as I was saying—the City Estate Liabilities—the City Estate Rent and its rents go to meet the liabilities, and discharge a debt upon that item?—They go to pay the interest upon the City Debentures.

DUBLIN.
April 6, 1879.
Mr. Thomas
O'Donnell.

DUBLIN
April 8, 1872
Mr. Thomas
O'Donnell.

784. And it is an improving estate, as you have stated?—Yes; there can be no mistake about that; but the City Treasurer will give you evidence upon that point, and is more convenient with that part of the subject than I am.

785. What was the total amount available to meet the City Estate Liabilities in 1878—the interest, &c.?—From the city rental account it will be perceived that the rents, and arrears of rents, collected and lodged in bank were £18,315 5s. 1d. (Appendix No. 9.)

786. CHAIRMAN.—On what page is that?—You will find it on the abstract. That represents the net amount lodged in bank on account of rents.

787. After allowances on poor rate, abatements, and other outgoings?—Certainly. (Appendix No. 10.)

788. DR. NERVOSE.—What is the total amount of interest paid on foot of City Estate Liabilities?—The annual amount payable is £6,739 18s. 2d. on Irish currency, and £940 on British currency. These two sums together. (Appendix No. 11.)

789. What is the total?—About £7,700.

790. What is the income to meet that?—Well, the income to meet that in 1878, from rents alone lodged, was £18,315 5s. 7d.; then from slippage and anchorage dues we had £2,315 6s. 1d.

791. To what purpose is the surplus devoted?—If there was a surplus available, it should go under the provisions of the 3rd & 4th of Victoria, section 131, towards the cleansing, lighting, and other expenses for municipal purposes.

792. The total under the head of Borough Fund receipts was in the year 1878?—Yes.—The total, including a balance that was to credit in bank on the 31st of August, 1877, was £31,574 3s. 6d. Included in that sum was the amount of the Borough Rate which had been collected, and which, as you are aware, formed the subject of discussion in the Court of Queen's Bench, and it forms a portion of the temporary indebtedness, because the Borough Fund is liable to the Borough Rate account for that amount.

793. MR. CORRAS.—That is the £3,700?—Yes; but you may take the revenue from the Borough Fund in round numbers for the year at £23,500.

794. MR. HERON.—That leaves a large surplus for the payment of interest?—Yes.

795. DR. NERVOSE.—With regard to the Waterworks Fund, will you analyse the income from that source to meet the Waterworks Fund Liabilities?—Well, the amount lodged by the Collector-General on rates for the year ended the 31st of August, 1878, was £32,321 1s. 9d.; £3,560 of that was the proportion of the Pipe Water Rate which was applicable to Fire Brigade purposes.

796. That is at 1½?—Yes; that being the proportion. The Government bounty lodged, in sum of rates, is, too, included in that—for Government buildings for pipe-water rate—was £372.

797. With regard to the Government bounty, that has been a recent addition—a contribution from the Government for premises required for Governmental purposes—that has been a recent addition to Corporation funds?—Yes; within the last three or four years.

798. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you may take it safely, at all events, that the income of the Corporation from the waterworks is over £30,000 to meet that debt of £374,589?—Yes; the interest we have to pay upon our debt, including the £14,100, for the instalment for the terminable annuity, may be taken in round numbers at £23,500. The shifting domestic water rate produces a sum in excess of that. We have got a pipe-water rate, a contract rate, and a meter rate, for the purpose of paying for the maintenance and all the expense in connexion with the fund.

799. I find here in the accounts are issued mortgages, £5,000?—The Corporation exercise a power given to them in respect of those that wherever they pay off a mortgage they can re-issue it. The loan remains pretty much the same.

800. DR. NERVOSE.—Are new works actually in

progress for the extension of the water supply at Vauxtry and Stillorgan—have they not been in contemplation and in progress?—New filter beds have been completed at the Vauxtry works, and an extension of the Stillorgan reservoir is in contemplation.

801. And they have purchased land at Stillorgan for the purpose of an extension of the reservoir?—Yes.

802. CHAIRMAN.—Will it be that the object of this line of examination is to show that even if all the townships were brought in—even if all the townships were brought in—they never could incur any liability, because there is a surplus on the income; is that so?—Certainly.

803. MR. WALKER.—But how do we know what the charges are?

DR. NERVOSE.—We want the witness to lay before the Commissioners the entire indebtedness of the city of Dublin, and we want also to lay before the Commissioners an account of the entire income of the city of Dublin.

MR. HERON.—This is the only fund applicable to pay old debts.

WITNESS.—I have given you the total indebtedness of the Corporation, and I have also given, as far as the city estate is concerned, the money available for paying the interest upon that indebtedness.

804. And you have further stated that this is an increasing fund?—Yes; it has an increasing income.

805. And you can show the same with respect to the waterworks?—Yes; from the Collector-General's judgments in book for the year ended 31st of August 1878, we received £32,321 for the several rates, and the total amount of interest payable on loans, mortgages, &c., including the instalment of £14,100 per annum to the Public Works Loan Commissioners, may be taken at £23,500 per annum. The difference between £23,500 and £32,321, leaves a good margin for maintenance and expense.

806. MR. HERON.—Will you give the same particular with regard to the Improvement Fund liability?—Yes.

807. DR. NERVOSE.—The Vauxtry cost item will disappear?—Yes; that is a small matter, and one penny in the pound will produce a fund sufficient to cover it for five years.

808. But it will disappear, under the statute?—It will.

809. MR. HERON.—Now give the Improvement Fund—state the amount of the income, and the amount of the indebtedness?—Yes.

810. CHAIRMAN.—The debt is £75,350?—Yes.

811. MR. HERON.—What is the interest upon that?—The interest upon that would be, in round numbers £5,000 per annum.

812. Upon all their liabilities?—Quite so.

813. And under the statute the liabilities are being paid off at the rate of one-twentieth per annum?—Yes; as far as regards the £50,000, and with respect to all except the Cattle Market debt.

814. CHAIRMAN.—And that is being paid off at the rate of £3,500 a year?—Yes. The greater portion of the interest on the Cattle Market debt is payable out of the profits on the market if they admit of it.

815. CHAIRMAN.—Has it actually paid it up to the present?—Yes, and it has up to the present shown a surplus.

816. In that book have you the entire amount of interest payable now by the Corporation?—I could make that up quite easily. If you wish, by-and-bye, I can put in a return showing the entire amount of interest payable by the Corporation. (Appendix No. 11.)

817. DR. NERVOSE.—And I would be glad if you would also prepare a return showing the increased annually since 1861 of the waterworks income.—(See Appendix No. 11.)

818. DR. NERVOSE.—You have gone through the Improvement Fund and the Cattle Market. Now let

us come to the District Sewer Fund—what is the income derivable from that fund?—The income from that fund amounts to £4,900, at 2d. in the pound on valuation.

819. Mr. Heron.—Is the Cattle Market financially paying?—Yes, and there is a surplus.

820. Dr. Norwood.—And the Vestry sum has disappeared according as the amounts disappear!—I don't think it will be necessary to strike a further rate. We only sent a receipt for £4, in the pound, but the Collector-General levied £4, and he is empowered to do so under the Act.

821. Which enables him to put on a ½d.?—Yes.

822. What are the rates during that year—could you bring them down to the present time?—I could if you wished.

823. Have you a return of those rates which are technically known as the municipal rates of the different townships?—I have.

824. Have you that return before you?—I have.

825. You state that the same rate for the city of Dublin is 4s. 6d. t.—Yes, for the municipality of Dublin for this year—for the year 1879.

826. What are the rates for the townships?—For Rathmines the figure I got from the return sent in is 2s. 4d.; for Pembroke, 3s. 8d.; for Kilmainham, 3s. 6d.; and I was not furnished with the rate for Drumcondra, but I put it down at 3s.

827. That is the maximum under their Act?—I believe so, and I am under the impression that they would require that amount of taxation to keep them going.

828. Dr. Norwood.—Their limit is 3s. t—I believe so; but I am not aware whether they have struck a rate at all or not. Those I have given you are municipal poundage rates.

829. Have you got the valuations of those places?—Yes. For rating purposes Dublin is valued at £608,000; Rathmines is valued at £98,065; Pembroke is valued at £84,968; Kilmainham, £8,911; and Drumcondra, at £13,000.

830. That being so, have you prepared a table showing the amount of increase or decrease upon the townships, and upon the city if the amalgamation were carried out as proposed by the Corporation?—I have. (Appendix No. 12.) Taking the present rates and the present valuation as the basis for my calculation, I have prepared a table showing what the decrease or increase would be. The results of my

calculation are as follows:—A rate of 4s. 6d. for Dublin, on a valuation of £608,000, ought to produce £126,800, and 2s. 4d., on £98,065 for Rathmines, would produce £11,440; 3s. 8d., on £84,968 for Pembroke, would produce £13,057; and 3s. 6d., on £8,911, for Kilmainham, would produce £1,559; and 3s., on the £13,000 for Drumcondra, would produce £1,910; and that would give a gross valuation of £212,944, and a gross product, £164,806.

831. For Dublin and the townships?—Yes—that would give a gross product of £164,806, as being the amount required for the purposes of the amalgamated district, and to be raised by a municipal rate over the whole district. I have then calculated the pounds upon £212,944, because I have added to the gross valuation £19,000 for the portions of the county that would be brought in. I have, I say, calculated what sum in the pound would produce £164,806, and I make it 3s. 11½d. in the pound for the whole district.

832. Over the whole district?—Yes; that would represent a poundage decrease as far as Dublin is concerned of 6½d., the amount of that decrease being £10,566 16s. 7d.; it would give a percentage increase as regards Rathmines of 1s. 7½d., the amount of that increase being represented by £8,189 16s. 7d.; it would give an increase of poundage represented in the Penrose township by 8½d. in the pound, the amount of the increase being £5,759 11s. 8d. It would give an increase of 5½d. in the pound in the case of Kilmainham, the amount of that increase being £334 12s. 8d.; and in the case of Drumcondra it would give a poundage increase of 11½d., which would be represented by a sum of £622 16s. 4d., and those sums gave a gross total of £212,785 8s. 3d. The valuation for the country portion which we propose to take in at 3s. 11½d., on £19,000, would give a sum of £3,770 8s. 4d., which, added to £212,785 8s. 3d., would give the amount of the decrease in the amount to be levied over Dublin.

833. That would represent all the charges for sanitary purposes in every portion of the amalgamated district?—So far as municipal rates are concerned.

834. How is the 4s. 6d. municipal rate of Dublin made up?—We have got a 2s. 4d. improvement rate; a 1s. 3d. pipe water rate; we have got an 8d. Grand Jury rate, a 2d. sewer rate, and 1d. Vesley cess.

835. That embraces all the rates comprehended in the municipal rates of the city of Dublin?—Those are all the amounts required so far as the Corporation is concerned.

DR. CHARLES A. CAMERON, examined.

Dr. Charles A. Cameron.

836. Mr. Heron.—You are city analyst of Dublin, Dr. Cameron?—I am.

837. How long have you been city analyst?—Since 1862.

838. What other offices do you hold under the Corporation?—I have been Medical Officer of Health in addition to the office of city analyst for some years past.

839. Are you aware of the proposal on the part of the Corporation to include the townships of Pembroke, Rathmines, Kilmainham, Drumcondra, within the new municipal boundary?—I am, and I strongly approve of it, although I am living in one of the townships you have named myself.

840. Will you now kindly state, as regards your own department, Dr. Cameron, the reasons you have of approving of the proposal of the Corporation?—Well, taking my own department into account, I think the sanitation of the districts proposed to be added to the central district, could be as well administered by the present sanitary staff as is the case at present with regard to the city.

841. Is it in your opinion important to have one central authority as the sanitary authority for Dublin and its environs?—I think so; because in Glasgow,

with its great population, so much larger than Dublin, there is only one sanitary staff; and in Liverpool, with half a million of people, there is only one sanitary staff, and in Manchester the same is the case.

842. And in your opinion ought there to be only one sanitary staff for Dublin?—I think so, and that the whole metropolitan area should be administered by one sanitary staff.

843. As regards the spread of disease, what are the reasons favouring a centralisation of the sanitary authority on that ground, Dr. Cameron?—Well, in the first place we have got what they have not got in any of the townships. We have a disinfecting chamber erected at considerable expense in the city of Dublin; it is quite available for all the districts proposed to be annexed.

844. Where the authority is divided is there a danger of a difference of opinion as regards the measure to be adopted for preventing the spread of disease and other matters?—Well there might be some, but I do not think that there would be much.

845. As regards the destruction of infected clothing, have you power with regard to that?—Yes, we have the necessary powers to destroy infected clothing, and to compensate the owners. All that could be done by one central authority or organisation better than by a

BENELUX
April 5, 1879.
Mr. Thomas
O'Donnell.

DUBLIN,
April 6, 1878.
Dr. Charles A.
Cameron.

number of small sanitary authorities, each having jurisdiction over four, five, or 10,000 inhabitants—that is my belief.

845. Do you superintend the carrying out of such measures under your inspection?—Yes. I superintended the disinfection of clothing and houses. We have recently appointed a sanitary staff for the special purpose of cleansing and disinfecting houses from which persons suffering from infectious diseases have been removed to hospital, or in which such persons have died.

847. That is a troublesome and delicate duty?—Yes, and it requires some special knowledge.

848. Do you see any difficulty in managing the townships, if annexed, under the one central authority as regards sanitary measures?—None whatever. Of course there would be additional sub-sanitary offices required for the new districts. There are in some of them at present sub-sanitary offices, but they are not policemen. With respect to the seizure and destruction of diseased meat, there does not appear to be any provision made in the townships. The inspectors employed for the purpose of detecting unsound food can only be useful officials if they are ordinary constables, because the power of arrest is not vested in any of the sanitary sub-officers, who are not actually policemen. Our inspectors are all policemen, who are acting under and paid by the Corporation. My impression is that in the townships there are few such persons.

849. Are there any other defects in the sanitary organisation of the townships?—They have no disinfecting chamber. I think, as a rule, they have not the same facilities for disinfecting houses as we have. With respect to the area for registration purposes, I wish to state that I think Dublin is rather unfairly placed, because all the elementary institutions and the two workhouses, and nearly all the hospitals and places of that kind are within the city, and the suburbs—and the northern suburbs especially—contribute to all these public institutions, and the deaths which occur in them are placed as a rule, or with very few exceptions, to the credit of the city, and in that way the city is made to appear, so far as the death rate is concerned, worse than it really is.

850. And all these deaths are placed to the debt of Dublin?—Nearly all of them. Besides, for registration purposes, I think it appears very extraordinary that the registration area should extend over four or five miles out to the south-east part of the city—a long way down to near Kingstown—out to Kingstown, in fact—and to end abruptly at the bridges on the north side of the city—to end at the boundaries of the city, where the new township of Dún Laoghaire joins it to the healthy suburbs, and that the northern suburbs of the city are excluded, or are calculated among the county statistics.

851. Are these some of the reasons why the death rate of Dublin appears so high?—They are some of the reasons. We have 45,000 persons belonging to the North and South Dublin Unions residing in purely rural parts of the county, and not included even in any township, and not included in the registration area, and not used for the statistics of the Registrar-General—15,000 persons whose sick and old people die in one or other of the two Dublin workhouses.

852. Now, as to the Department of Public Health, and as regards the sewerage of this large district—don't you consider that it ought to be under one central authority?—I am clearly of opinion that the whole sewerage of Dublin—of the metropolitan area—should be vested in one authority, and under one chief engineer, and such a state of things would at once put an end to any possibility of conflict in jurisdiction or opinion.

853. Will you state the medical reasons you have, Dr. Cameron, for coming to such a conclusion?—Well, the size of the sewers, and the mode in which the sewers might be ventilated, and the different modes by which the sewage from houses in particular streets should be discharged into the sewers, might be all

matters of opinion about which different views might be held by different engineers, and it would be better to have one engineer of acknowledged eminence, who would be responsible for the proper arrangement of the sewerage, and by having a large and important area it is more than likely that an engineer of acknowledged eminence would be found ready to undertake the duty than would be the case when the several smaller surrounding districts were each provided with their own engineer. However, this is a subject more for Mr. Neville than myself.

854. Is there any other suggestion you wish to make with reference to the subject comprehended within the scope of the present inquiry?—Nothing more than this—that I think, as an ordinary citizen, I should like to see Dublin having a larger population, and having a more important place assigned to it amongst the cities of the United Kingdom, because the population of the city of Dublin, that appears amongst the other large towns that are published in the statistics of the Registrar-General of England, is comparatively small, and I should like, as a citizen, to see Dublin holding a higher position.

855. You would wish to see the boundaries of Dublin extended to the natural boundaries?—I would.

Cross-examined by Mr. S. Walker.

856. What is the death-rate of Dublin, Dr. Cameron?—The death rate of Dublin for some years past has been twenty-eight per thousand per annum.

857. That is not the highest registration?—That is the actual death-rate—twenty-eight to twenty-eight and-a-half per thousand—but it has risen last winter to a very high degree, especially in some districts—to fifty and sixty per thousand—especially in the two districts where the union workhouses are situated, which are more healthy naturally than some of the central districts of the city, and that shows that a large number of deaths were unduly charged to the districts in which the poorhouses are situated.

858. CHAIRMAN.—You know the townships of Rathfarnham and Pembroke very well, Dr. Cameron?—Yes, I do; I live in the Pembroke township.

859. It was stated yesterday that very few of the labouring classes are living in those townships—that they live principally in Dublin. The working classes go out to work at Rathfarnham, and Rathgar, and in the Pembroke townships in the morning and return to town in the evenings to their homes. Is not that your experience very much in each of those localities?—It is, and that has been my experience for a great many years past. There are particular trains as the Kingstown line for the accommodation of working men at an early hour in the morning, and also in the evening, and there are particular trains on the Rathfarnham tramway line at a certain hour in the morning and evening to facilitate working men in going to and returning from their work. The great reason for such a habit on the part of the working classes is that lodgings are to be had at a cheaper rate, and are more numerous, and more easily procurable in Dublin than in the country.

860. And then, I presume, in case of sickness or of anything of that sort in the families of those people, or amongst those people themselves, they avail themselves of the hospitals of Dublin?—They do; and my experience is that broken down people from all parts of the country take refuge in the poorer parts of the city, and remain in such places, finding their way ultimately to the hospitals, workhouses, or charities of various kinds that exist in the city; that is my experience, and it may be taken as one of the causes of the gradual increase of the death-rate of the city.

861. That would not be felt by the townships; do they go into the townships?—I should say not; certainly not to any appreciable extent.

862. But if the townships get their labouring population from the city, and that that labouring population—or the people who go to make it up live in the city—don't the townships then get a great advantage

by not having to contribute to the hospitals, poor-houses, and so on!—They do, of course. Another way in which they derive advantage is in the case of domestic servants. Domestic servants, I need hardly say, constitute a large proportion of the inhabitants of every district, and the domestic servants when discharged from situations which they held in the fashionable townships, come into the city and either go into lodgings or hospitals out of those districts.

853. As a medical man, living in one of those districts, is it your opinion a great advantage to the residents and families of such districts to have the parent

city—if I may so call it—kept in a healthy and clean condition!—Undoubtedly, because many persons reside in the suburbs on account of the educational advantages which the city affords; most, if not all, of the important educational institutions are situated within the city boundaries, and they and their children of course have access to those places, and go in and out of town, and get their provisions from town, and if disease is rife in the city it is a matter of serious moment to them if it spreads to these suburbs. In this way they get both the advantages and the disadvantages attendant on the proximity of the city.

DEBATE.
April 5, 1873.
Dr. Charles A. Gammie.

Mr. O'DONNELL, City Accountant, recalled.

Mr. Thomas O'Donnell.

854. Dr. Norgood.—Have you prepared a return which we desire on the part of the Corporation to hand in to the Commissioners, showing the debts of the old Corporation—the debts due by the old Corporation—and those debts added by the present Corporation, and the purposes for which they were so added!—I have,

[Document handed in. Appendix 4.]

855. There was a question raised during the discussion with regard to the increase of salaries and so on: have you prepared, for the information of the Commissioners, a return with regard to that matter!—Yes, I have got a statement showing the amount of the salaries. (Appendix 13.) There was a statement handed in to the Committee on the Local Government and Taxation of Towns Commission, at page 417 of the report of the Select Committee. The total amount shown as paid for salaries in the year 1873–1876 was £15,250, and the actual amount payable at present is £14,839 12s. 6d. as compared with 1873–76.

856. Under what date is that last amount!—Up to the present date.

857. That is a net decrease—how much!—A net decrease of about £400.

858. Mr. Walker.—Some of these salaries were struck off as illegal!—Not at all, there was no salary struck out as illegal.

859. Was there not some question about Mr. Crofton's salary!—No; that was not a question of salary at all, but one of compensation.

860. The question raised was as to its chargeability to one fund and then to another!—Well, that was part of the question raised.

861. Dr. Norgood.—Look at that return for the year 1873 which may be found useful. It is a return in the waterworks report of that date, but we have it in a separate form!—Yes; I can give the Commissioners a copy.

862. Well then furnish them with one!

863. CHAIRMAN.—Does this relate to salaries?

Dr. Norgood.—No, this return is with regard to the water contracts with the townships; it gives, with reference to the townships, the returns under the Act of Parliament regulating the constitution of a valuation rate in the parish, and the statutable obligations of the Corporation and the several townships, and if you turn to Table No. 1, you will see the value of it. It gives extracts from the statute. (Appendix 14.)

864. Dr. Norgood. (To witness).—That return that you have given up to the present includes all the salaries of the people at present in the service of the Corporation in every department!—Yes; made out on the same basis as the one handed to the Select Committee of which I have already spoken.

865. It is merely a continuation of that one!—It is an amendment of it.

Re-examined by Dr. Norgood.

866. Are you aware whether or not all the charges for the Public Health Department were charged for several years upon the Borough Fund!—Yes, they were.

867. And there was no special rate levied for the support of the sanitary department during those years!—No, never.

868. Then the deficiency did not arise upon the charges upon the Borough Fund pure and simple, but upon sanitary charges upon the Borough Fund!—That is the conclusion I arrive at, when we remember that we paid close on £30,000 of the sum mentioned in that return that I gave to Mr. W. P. O'Brien, the Local Government Board Inspector at the time, he made an inquiry into the change in the incidence of taxation.

869. What was the amount actually levied out of the Borough Fund, as shown in that return, for sanitary purposes in 1871!—Over £30,000.

870. And if that sum had not been produced by the Borough Fund there should have been a special sanitary rate!—Certainly.

871. And therefore the amount so levied went directly for sanitary purposes!—Quite so. There would have been no deficiency in the Borough Fund at all, but that it had been enabled with the charge for sanitary expenses. There would, on the other hand, have been a large surplus, which would have been applicable to the reduction of taxation in another way. It would have gone to aid of the Improvement Fund.

872. The deficit in the year that they sought to levy a Borough rate arose from the accumulation of the charges under the sanitary department!—Well, yes; that is the conclusion I have arrived at—since 1866, since the inception of the sanitary charge.

Cross-examined by Mr. Walker.

873. Have you got the estimate of the Council, and the receipt of the Collector-General for the Borough Rate—can you get that for us!—Yes.

874. CHAIRMAN.—And also get the receipt for the water rate for the present year!—Yes, you can have them.

875. Mr. Corson.—To what fund are the sanitary expenses now charged!—they are charged to the improvement rate.

876. Is that under an alteration by legislative enactment!—Yes, there is a clause in the Public Health Act of 1875 which gives the Local Government Board power upon inquiry to change the incidence of taxation, and in accordance with the provisions of that clause an inquiry was held here by Mr. O'Brien, who was at that time the Local Government Board Inspector for this district, and the result of that inquiry is that now the sanitary expenses are put

DUBLIN,
April 6, 1873.
Mr. Thomas
O'Donnell.

upon the improvement rate or fund, and we have struck a 2d. rate in addition. It also takes away the limit. The incidence having been changed, it removes the limit of taxation for sanitary purposes—for the purpose of the Act.

893. Dr. Newcomer.—That is under the recent Act of 1873?—Yes.

894. It is under that Act that the power of changing the incidence of taxation from one source to another?—Yes; before the incidence was so changed the improvement rate was only 2d. in the pound—now we can put on any rate we require for sanitary purposes.

895. CHAIRMAN.—Kindly, now, give me the estimate for the water rate for the present year. How much is required to be levied?—The amount of the present sent to the Collector-General was £39,794

16s. 6d. That amount, I need not say, is far in excess of what would be produced by a 1s. 3d. rate. That is the estimated amount of our total expenditure, and all the Collector-General could assess would be but a 1s. 3d. rate, but we send him the total amount of our expenditure in the receipt. The rest is then paid out of the "contract," "meter," and "extra municipal" rates.

896. Then your water rate is not sufficient to pay the interest on the debt and expenses?—It is not, per se.

897. That is what I say!—Certainly. The domestic water rate and public water rate are sufficient to pay the interest on the debt; but we require to have "contract," "meter," and "extra municipal" rates, for the purpose of giving us a surplus to pay for maintenance and other charges.

Mr. J. R.
Ingram.

Mr. J. R. ISRAM examined.

898. Mr. Heron.—You are chief of the Fire Brigade of the city of Dublin?—I am.

899. How long have you filled that office?—Since September, 1862.

900. At the present time how many men and horses have you in your department?—Six horses and twenty-nine men.

901. You have one central station?—Yes.

902. In reference to the question of the extension of the city boundary, and of the townships being annexed, have you considered the matter in reference to the question of what would be necessary in case the townships were added, and put within the municipal boundary?—I have.

903. And what do you consider ought to be done?—I would give the townships proper facilities for relief in case of fire. I would move the Winstanley-street station, because it is in a very bad place, and on account of the vast amount of wealth and property there is in Thomas-street and along that way—I would move the Winstanley-street station up to the head of Thomas-street, and by that means I would take in also the Kilmainham district, from which the station I have named in its new position would be easy of access. For the Rathmines township I should give a station where the police-office in that district now stands, and I would also give them two escape stations, which they have not at present. I would give the Pembroke township a station, I would give them a station near where the Town Hall of the Commissioners is, and I would give a station on the north side of the city to take in Cheeton and the district about there. I would place that station in Amiens-street.

904. How many stations in all would be necessary, in your opinion?—Six, not taking in escape stations.

905. You have, as we all know, been very active in the discharge of your duties since the time of your appointment in 1862. Did you, on several occasions, although not bound to do so, in response to applications made to you, go into the townships to attend fires, and go outside the city boundary?—Oh, yes; several times.

906. Just take now first as regards the instances I ask you to put on record, by giving the dates and any remarks you may have to make, of the instances in which you attended fires outside the present municipal boundary; first of all as regards Rathmines?—In 1863 I was called to a fire at St. Barnabas, county Dublin.

907. CHAIRMAN.—Is that in any of the townships?—It is in the county Dublin—a distance of five miles from the nearest station. The fire originated in a hayrick containing sixty tons, a portion of which, with the dwelling-plane and stabling, was saved.

908. Mr. Heron.—How often have you been called on to go outside the municipal boundary altogether?—Sixty-three times.

909. Now, was there recently any remarkable fire in either of the townships of Pembroke or Rathmines?—Yes.

910. Which was that one?—The one at the whiskey distillery at Harold's-cross.

911. Describe the fire!—The fire originated in one of the top buildings, and I went out there by the authority of the Lord Mayor. We took a steamer, and, I think, nine men and the toolcart, in which the Lord Mayor accompanied me. I set to work there, but the hydrants being on a different principle to ours, I could not use mine, and I was obliged to use their appliances. We went in and fought the fire inside, and extinguished it, and for which the Corporation got nothing whatsoever, and we saved a quantity of property which, on the least calculation, must have been worth between £14,000 and £15,000.

912. Had the township in which that fire took place any appliances by the use of which that fire could have been fought with and successfully put out?—Not at all, nor trained men either.

913. CHAIRMAN.—In which township did that occur—Rathmines?—Yes; Rathmines.

914. Mr. Heron.—What have they there in the way of a fire engine?—They have a small hand-engine which was, I believe, formerly the property of one of the insurance companies—indeed, I think it is the old engine of the Prudential Company.

915. And as regards the fire in the distillery, that was almost useless, I suppose?—Oh, yes.

916. What was the date of that fire?—In 1877 that fire occurred.

917. CHAIRMAN.—That is the fire at the distillery?—Yes.

918. Mr. Heron.—Since that time has the township got any better appliances for the extinguishing of fires?—Not that I am aware of. They may have, but I am not aware of their existence.

919. On that occasion did you get any assistance from the township whatever, or from the men of the township?—The only assistance they gave me was to take their own engine away and to give me the water that they were using for the steamer.

920. Was there any other fire recently in Rathmines, which you assisted to put out?—There was a fire which I declined to go to, a fire at the flour mills next to the Mount Jerome Cemetery.

921. Why did you decline to go out to that fire?—I declined to go out to it because I had not the authority of the Lord Mayor to do so, and I would not take upon myself the responsibility of leaving the city unprotected.

922. And what became of that fire?—The building was burnt to the ground.

923. CHAIRMAN.—What year was that in, Mr. Ingram?—I think it was last year.

924. Mr. Heron.—Now what was the value of the

REMARK.
April 5, 1878.
Mr. J. H.
Ingram.

property destroyed at that fire—I presume between £1,000 and £1,000.

923. Was there any other recent fire in the township of Rathmines?—There was a late fire in that district that we were at—it was another flour-mill.

923. Please now give the name of the place and the date?—It was in 1879, and the name of the place is Loder's Flour Mills.

924. Were you at that fire?—I was.

925. Give us the history of it. What hour did you go out to it?—I think about eleven or twelve o'clock.

926. In the daytime?—No, at night. About eleven or twelve o'clock at night.

927. Well what happened?—A police constable came from it, and gave the alarm of the fire, and I immediately "stood by," as we call it, that is, I got everything ready to start for the scene of the fire, and I asked the constable to go and procure the authority of the Lord Mayor, and I told him that I could not leave the station otherwise. Soon after that the owner of the mill came to me and told me that he had obtained the authority of the Lord Mayor, and I accepted his word, that he had got the authority, as he was a respectable gentleman. Well, the gentleman went out with me on my tool-cart. I took a steamer with me on that occasion also. On reaching the place I found that I could get no water that would be of service to me, so I used the water in an adjoining quarry-hole. While we were in the building the mill door was turned on, and we had to beat a retreat, but we saved part of the premises, the outer-offices, but the mill was destroyed. When I got there the mill was slight from top to bottom.

928. What was the amount of property destroyed in that instance?—£10,000 or £15,000.

929. Was there any engine there of real use?—Well, to tell you the truth, the engine was really doing very good work.

930. But it did not succeed in extinguishing the fire?—Indeed it did not, nor did I, but it had gone too far; but I stopped it from going into the outer offices.

931. Now, I put this question to you, Captain Ingram, supposing there was a station on the spot, in the township of Rathmines, in what you would suppose to be a reasonable place for warning to be given, and any of access and a steamer there, what would—supposing that to be the state of things in that township—have happened most probably in the case of that fire?—Why the building would have been saved. The principle upon which I go, is the principle upon which I was trained in relation to the establishments for large cities. Now I would have the whole of the townships one network of telegraphic communication. I would have a well-appointed central station, with which I would communicate from the outlying stations at any moment, if necessary. If Rathmines were in trouble, all they would have to do would be immediately to communicate with the central station from which immediate assistance would be rendered. Even in Dublin at the present time, I have not enough of telegraphic communication. The only places that I am in telegraphic communication with are the City Hall, William-street, Winetavern-street, the General Post Office and the Royal Dublin Society House. If I had the city arranged for fire protection purposes, as I would wish I would have it in this way. In my opinion each street should have a telegraph box, that box possessing, of course, its distinguishing number, and in it a place for the insertion of a key. I would have a key given to every policeman or respectable citizen, for there would be no necessity for any knowledge of telegraphy, and in case of an alarm of fire the use of the keys would be inserted into the nearest box, and by that means telegraphic communication would be established with the central station, and the man on duty at that station would, on hearing the signal at once look at the dial on which those numbers of the boxes and stations would be recorded, and knowing he would see it registered as box "25," he would know it was at the City Hall, at the top of Parliament-street, and the foot

of Corkhill. That is the way in which, in my opinion, Dublin should be arranged for the purpose of my department. The district is perfectly unsafe as it is at present, and it is only when some terrible calamity comes on you that you will find the unprotected state you are in.

932. Had you recently a remarkable fire at Kingstown?—Yes, we had. It was on board an East Indiaman, called the "Nagore." I sent out two hand-engines and men on the authority of Sir James Mackay, who was then Lord Mayor; but the fire had taken such a hold of the cargo that I knew it was useless to pump water into her, and that we should eventually have to scuttle her, by sending some round shot into her. My engines were sent to the vessel's side on floats. After a time I told the Lord Mayor—for in virtue of his office as High Admirel of the Port I understood he had the power—"If you give me authority to scuttle her I will do so, and that will be the means of saving the vessel and her cargo." He gave me the requisite authority, and I scuttled the ship, which stood in the centre of the harbour. She was subsequently pumped out by Moses, Walpole, Webb, and Bewley, and the cargo sold, as I was informed, for double what it would otherwise have realized. I brought the fire-engines out on floats, as the ship stood away out in the harbour.

933. There were no other fire-engines there?—None that I am aware of. Then I went out on another occasion to Bessin's Hotel at Bray, and saved the hotel there, and it would have been burned but for the assistance rendered by our brigade; and on that occasion I set my engine to work, and got the water from the sea.

934. I believe, Captain Ingram, the late Sir John Gray was in favour of an extension of the fire brigade system?—Yes, decidedly he was.

935. And I believe he organized a plan for it?—One of his chief aims in connexion with the advancement of the whole district was to spread the fire brigade system over the whole of these townships.

936. Were you aware of his proposal to the Rathmines Commissioners to unite in having the fire brigade's services rendered available for their township also?—I think so.

937. I believe you also went to Maynooth, on the occasion of the disastrous fire at the college there?—I did.

938. They had no means to put out the fire there on that occasion?—They had an engine, and a good one too, and did good work with it; but they certainly would not have been able to save by any means as much of the building in comparison with what the steamer that we brought was able to do. On that occasion we had to travel a distance of fifteen miles.

939. Have you studied the fire brigade systems in other cities and towns?—Yes.

940. In Glasgow?—Yes.

941. In Liverpool?—Yes.

942. In London?—Yes.

943. Are you of opinion that a great city and a series of outlying districts should be under one system?—London is taking in all the villages for miles around, under the one system and one union—the one connection all through. The whole is under Captain Shaw, and you could not possibly get along without it.

944. Have any fires occurred in the Penrhoske Township?—There have been some fires in that township too.

945. Please give the instances in which fires occurred in the Penrhoske Township?—There were eleven in the Penrhoske Township.

946. Within what time?—From 1865 to 1878.

947. Have they any fire-engine in the Penrhoske Township?—I don't think they have a fire-engine, but I get them up a hose reel. They would work on the pressure of the Vauxhall water. Penrhoske has not an engine that I am aware of.

948. Was there anything remarkable about those fires in the Penrhoske Township as regards loss of

PERRIS
April 1, 1874.
Mr. J. R.
Ingram.

property and so on? Did you go to each of those fires?—I did, but I didn't go to the fire in Sandy-mound-road.

949. As regards those fires, was there any loss of property?—There was a considerable loss of property, but there was no loss in comparison to the loss in Rathmines.

950. They were only houses?—Yes, and shops. The last I was at was in Upper Baggott-street.

951. When was that?—On the 27th of November. The fire originated in an oil store immediately outside the bridge. I very soon put it out, and it did not get into the main building, and if it had got into the main building it would have done considerable damage.

952. Were there any officials from the district present at that fire?—I did not see any.

953. Is there any fire brigade in the Pembroke Township?—No, to my knowledge there is not. I know they have got a hose reel and some hose which they ordered.

954. A hose reel is only used where there is high pressure from the main?—Yes, that is the only way you can use it. It is what is called delivering hose.

955. And if they hadn't the Vartry water it would be of no use at all?—Not the slightest.

956. Supposing the townships are included within the municipal boundary, would you require an additional number of men?—Certainly.

957. At the present time you have twenty-nine men?—Yes.

958. Have you enough men for your present requirements?—No, I have not.

959. Have you calculated how many men you would require, supposing Dublin was extended as desired, and included those four townships?—It would require sixty men at least to do the work.

960. There are trained men?—Yes, men who have served in either the United States or Royal Navy.

961. Are your men from the Navy?—Yes, without exception, with the exception of the garrisons.

962. Would you require an increased number of horses?—Of course I would.

963. Do you include in your contemplated arrangement for Dublin two central stations, one on the north side and one on the south side of the river?—We would want to have one good central station, with a good drill yard and a repairing yard, the same as the Metropolitan Fire Department have in London; and you would want to have a certain class of men always on hand to be sent out to districts, if any alarm came, at a moment's notice; and you would want to have three stations more for escape. I have recommended in my last year's report on my department, furnished to the Corporation, one extra fire-escape station.

964. Are there any fire-escape stations in the townships?—Not to my knowledge, and besides that I may mention a matter that may not be generally thought of, and it is—the present principle of fire-escape in use in Dublin would not be suited to the wants of the townships, in which the houses generally lie back, with large gardens in front, and there would be no means of getting them in to put up to such houses, without first having the rails pulled down. I need not say that the time it would take to do such a thing would render the escape useless, and I therefore think, that for such a class of houses in the townships as I have spoken of, you would want American Truck Ladders, running on four wheels, each one running past those of the others, and so constructed as to be able to raise the ladders on the telescopic principle. Unless that was done, I do not see how you could get fire escapes into those houses.

965. You have mentioned about the very serious losses of property in Rathmines; were you at any other fires in Rathmines where there was a serious loss of property?—I have been to eleven in Rathmines, or including Rathmines, within the past ten years.

966. Were there any other fire in factories or shops with loss of property as regards trade besides the two you have mentioned?—There were three, and one was

burnt down completely—the distillery and the two flour mills.

967. How much did the damage done at those fires amount to altogether?—I should say nearly £30,000.

968. And I believe the annual cost of the Fire Brigade is £3,600?—The cost last year was not quite £3,600.

969. At all events that £30,000 would have paid your expenses for many years?—Indeed it would. I consider that if a steamer costs you £600 and goes to one fire and saves £7,000 worth of property, I consider that the steamer pays herself.

970. What was the cost of the steamers you have?—I don't think either of the steamers I have ever cost £400.

Cross-examined by Mr. Walker.

971. You have only one station?—In fact, I have not a station.

972. Are you short-handed of men?—I am, sir.

973. By how many are you short-handed of men?—At the least calculation I would want ten men more, and then I would only be able to do the work.

974. That would be narrowing it pretty well?—Yes. I may tell you that I have had recently an addition to my staff of nine men from the waste water department.

975. Then it is very well that there are not more fires in Dublin?—Well, indeed it is. But with the staff under my command, we have, I venture to say, done our work well; especially considering that we had the only fire that required to be specially dealt with that took place in the kingdom—the only banked-up fire which we successfully worked—for they would not know how to break up a fire, probably, anywhere in Europe.

976. CHAIRMAN.—You have given us the number of fires in Rathmines for the last ten or twelve years. May I ask you how many fires there have been in the city of Dublin during the same period—ten or twelve years?—I had 343 fires last year in the city of Dublin, and I had 68 in the month of December last. I shall have pleasure in presenting you with a copy of my last annual report.

977. Does it contain a statement of the recommendations you have mentioned in the course of your evidence with reference to the fire brigade system for the whole metropolitan district?—No; it is only my annual report on fires in the city of Dublin.

978. Have they any hydrants in Rathmines?—Yes, I think they have, but they are on a different principle to ours.

979. What is the pressure in Rathmines from the mains—what height could they throw water from their mains there?—I don't know that they could throw it any height at all. Mr. Purke Neville can give you information as to that better than I can.

980. How many steamers have you got?—I have got two.

981. How many would you require to carry out this extended work for the entire district?—I would not require any steamers if they only send the Vartry to me.

982. But you know Rathmines have not got the Vartry?—Well, I think the sooner they adopt it the better for themselves.

983. Do I understand you to say that you would be able to have an efficient brigade to work over a district including, in addition to the city, Rathmines, Ranelagh, Frankfort, Dún Laoghaire, Kilmainham, and all those places, with sixty men and the two steam engines?—No; if you would not give me the Vartry I would require two more steam engines.

984. Would not those steamers be practically fit for the benefit of Dublin, and not for the benefit of the townships?—But I don't use my steamers in Dublin at all, because I have such a magnificent water pressure.

985. You can work from the Vartry?—Yes. The steamers have only been used for the outlying districts.

EDINBURGH,
April 8, 1878.
Mr J. R.
Ingram.

I only work them when I am unable to have the advantages of the Vartex pressure.

986. How do you get the water in Dublin?—I have a stand pipe and a Battersea bell hydant. We lose no time in turning out; I think that will be generally admitted.

987. Supposing you were to get the brigade you contemplate up—do you think the Rathmines, Rathgar, and those other people benefiting by it should pay the same rate as the Dublin people do. In point of fact, is it not really and substantially that you would be getting nine-tenths of the benefit in Dublin, and only one-tenth of the benefit would be for Rathmines, Rathgar, and the other townships?—I look upon the principle as this—as matter how you might believe in your own security you might be in dread of your neighbour. We know that in the districts of Rathmines and Rathgar, where there are no party walls going above the roofs, if a fire takes place in one house it may injure several on either side of it. I had a sense of that kind, in which a fire occurred in one house, and I had to go six houses below in order to cut off its further communication with the adjoining premises.

988. If you take the experience in the future to be the same as in the past in these two townships, you would not be troubled very much by them, because in thirteen years you have had only twenty-two fires in the two.

Mr. Heron.—That is, fires reported to him. We don't know how many other fires there may have been.

989. CHAIRMAN.—As a matter of fact, don't you think, judging by the experience of the past, you would be keeping up that enlarged brigade for the benefit of the citizens of Dublin, and making the Rathmines people pay for it?—Well, Rathmines is growing in wealth and prosperity every day, and also in manufactures, and calculating these things by the experience of other places we know that as towns grow, and com-

more and wealth increase, fires become more numerous. But I recollect when these things could not be said of Rathmines, for I know the time when she had no manufacture.

990. But as to Rathmines and Rathgar—these places are very exempt from fires—I hope they won't in the future.—You may depend they won't in the future, when they increase in prosperity and wealth.

991. What did the fire brigade cost last year. I find on reference to the accounts at page 122—that the money available was £3,881 l*s*. You will find we lived on £3,881 l*s*. 7*d*.

992. And where did the balance go to?—I presume it is in the hands of the treasurer.

993. If you are short nine or ten men, it is strange that that should be so with a balance to your credit of about £1,000 l*s*.—But I have had nine or ten men since that. I have had nine or ten men extra added to my staff since the publication of those accounts.

994. But you have only twenty-nine!—That is so; but we had less.

995. But you said you were shorthanded, and yet they paid the expense of your department, and had £1,000 in hand more than they spent. What I am asking you is—why didn't they give you out of that the ten additional men that you wanted?—They have transferred those men to me about two weeks ago.

996. On the account furnished up to the 3rd of August, 1878, they had in hand—and they put down themselves that they had in hand—towards the expenses of the Fire Brigade, £3,881 17*s*. 7*d*.—The accountant can tell you short than better than I can.

997. What was the actual cost of the Brigade?—The cost of the Brigade, according to the published return of the city accountant, was £2,891 l*s*. 7*d*.

998. There was £900, which should have gone to keep up the Fire Brigade, and that has gone to something else.

Mr. O'DONNELL recalled.

Mr Thomas
O'Donnell.

999. CHAIRMAN.—At page 122 of the City Accounts it is stated that the receipts to the credit of the Fire Department amount to £3,881 17*s*. 7*d*., and Captain Ingram says the cost was only £2,891 l*s*. 7*d*. What became of the balance?—If you refer to page 141 of the accounts, you will see that the amount that was expended upon the Fire Brigades in maintenance, for the year ended the 31st of August, 1878, is shown in that account to be £3,891 l*s*. 7*d*. That shows that they were living during this year within their income, having a difference to their credit to be brought forward to the next account. But there is another matter which I should state in connection with this account, that at page 123, under the head of "Paid clerks, inspectors, turnsooks, As., &c., £2,117 3*s*. 2*d*." that included in the expenditure charged there, I understand are ten men who were acting as waste-water inspectors.

1000. No. What Captain Ingram says is that those men have only been given to him about two weeks ago!—That may be, but they were always on his staff.

Captain Ingram.—That is a mistake. They were not.

Mr. O'Donnell.—They wore the uniform at any rate. It was with the view of relieving the Fire Brigade account that those men were so transferred until the Fire Brigade account would be able to support them.

Captain Ingram.—When the Fire Brigade last

the halfpenny in the pound which was levied in its aid, Sir John Gray said we could not get on without it, and he transferred those ten men over to the brigade.

1001. CHAIRMAN.—What will the cost of those ten men be?—About one pound a head weekly.

Dr. Norwood.—Under the Act of 1874 the halfpenny was re-imposed again, and in the intermediate time the Brigade was unshorthanded.

Mr. Cotton.—And now they seem to have too much money.

Mr. Ingram.—But next year we won't.

1002. Mr. Cotton.—After paying for these men, that will leave £400 still!—Yes.

1003. CHAIRMAN.—Would you propose to put a steamer at Rathmines and a steamer at the north side of the city?—I would give them a steamer each until such time as you would get the Vartex or give a high pressure.

1004. Have you made any estimate to carry out this efficiently. In saying that you could do the work with sixty men, have you made any estimate as to what the cost would be for all?

Mr. Heron.—It would cost about £3,000 a year, in my opinion.

CHAIRMAN.—That would be throwing nearly £3,000 a year on the townships.

Mr. Heron.—No, it would not, because we would pay according to our valuation.

The inquiry was adjourned until next morning.

DUBLIN,
April 8, 1879.
Mr. Joseph T.
Pim.

DUBLIN.—THIRD DAY, APRIL 8TH, 1879.

Mr. JAMES COOKE PIM examined by Mr. Heron, &c.

1003. Mr. Pim, I believe you are a ratepayer both in the city and in Rathmines?—Yes, in both.

1004. To a very large extent?—Yes.

1005. How much, about, are you rated in the city?—It is over £3,000 a year. That is the interest of the sum of which I am a member.

1006. And for Rathmines?—About £500, I think.

1007. Now, Mr. Pim, have you for some time given consideration to the question about uniting the surrounding townships to the city of Dublin?—Yes, for three or four years past. I was induced to look into the matter—in fact, in consequence of my objection to the Corporation main drainage scheme, and then looking into the dealings that took place between Rathmines and Pembroke townships and the city, in reference to that scheme, I came to the conclusion that they ought to be united to Dublin, and that this sort of struggle that goes on between the two for getting off at the cheapest possible rate is injurious and objectionable to the whole—that is taking the city and the townships together. What I am considering is the fact that the city and the townships are, in reality, one, and I am considering the interest of the whole and not the interest of individual parties.

1008. Now do you entertain any opinion as to whether the townships ought to have been originally formed or not?—I think it was a great mistake.

1009. For what reason?—I think the line between the township and the city is a purely arbitrary line; it depends on the accident of the existence of the two Canals or the Circular road. It has enclosed Dublin in a ring fence. The circumstances of Dublin are different from any other city I know in being enclosed in this way, so that it cannot grow.

1010. Are you of opinion, Mr. Pim, that the area for building purposes within the municipal district, as it exists at present, has been practically exhausted?—Well, there is a great deal of land not yet built upon, but it is not in favourable positions for building, so that, practically, all the ground within the area available for the purpose has been built on.

1011. Do you consider that these townships of Rathmines and Pembroke, Kilmainham and Drumcondra, really form parts of the city?—Yes.

1012. Do you entertain the same opinion as to Clontarf?—Yes, I do; I think they are all really parts of the city.

1013. Do the householders of these townships make daily use of the city as a rule?—Yes. Certainly they do just the same as the people living in the city; not of course every one living in the townships; but it appears to me the difference between a man living in Rathmines and a man living in Fitzwilliam-square is really nothing, so far as the city is concerned. It makes him to live in Rathmines or in Fitzwilliam-square, but he is just as much belonging to the city in one place as in the other.

1014. Has your attention been directed to the statement that the townships for business purposes make more use of the city roads than the persons living on the quays or in the centre of the city—that is, that the carriage of all the goods, for instance brought to Rathmines, exercises a greater weight and tax upon the roads of the city than the carriage of goods brought either, say to your bazaar or to M'Dermott's?—Well, they have to travel a greater distance of course, and therefore, have to go over a greater amount of the city roads. Practically speaking, the main thoroughfares, like Harcourt-street, Great George's-street, and Richmond-street, are more used by men in Rathmines than by men living in Thomas-street, or such streets as Sackville-street.

1015. As regards the relations between the Corporation, which is the central authority for Dublin, and the

Commissioners, who are the authorities for the townships, first of all do you know have there been conflicts of authority or of interest? Have you noticed it?—Yes, it has taken place in reference to the water supply and on the question of drainage.

1016. As regards the number of members of the Corporation, are you aware that there are sixty members of the Town Council, and that in all the townships at present there are fifty-seven Commissioners, I believe?—I look upon that as a waste of strength. There are two sets of people doing the duties, the business of one, and it is hard enough to get suitable men to govern the Corporation and to undertake the duties they have to undertake. By increasing the number of persons required you increase the difficulty of getting good men.

1017. Well, then, the number of gentlemen engaged in the management of the business of the city of Dublin, and of the township, is from 116 to 118 persons—that is the whole governing body?—Yes.

1018. Do you consider that number to be wholly excessive?—Quite excessive. The municipal towns of England—the largest of them—larger than Dublin and all the townships together have only sixty-four.

1019. That applies to the governing bodies?—Yes.

1020. As regards the number of the officials; they have in the townships separate staffs?—Yes; that is still worse, for you have them repeated four or five times over, and, of course, with additional expense, and the work not so well done. The public make great complaints about the Corporation, but no Board can do its business well unless it starts with having good officials. To have good officials in these days you must be able to pay them, and it is manifest that a large area ought to be able to pay a higher salary than a small area. If you want to have first-class officers you must pay them first-class salaries. The salaries paid here in Dublin are nothing like what are paid in English towns, even in towns no larger than Dublin.

1021. Have you made a comparison, as regards areas of the different towns and the incomes and the salaries of officials?—Yes; there is a book published called "The Municipal Corporations Companion," published by Waterlow and Sons (Limited), London, in which you will find the salaries of all the officers, the names of the Corporations, the area, and population of the towns, and all the statistics on the point. You will find in that what I have said, that the officers are paid very much more in English towns, no larger than Dublin.

1022. Would there, in your opinion Mr. Pim, be any real difficulty in managing the entire area of Dublin and the surrounding districts or townships under one governing body?—I do not think so; I do not see any reason why there should be any more difficulty than there is in managing very much larger towns in England.

1023. Would you wish to give any illustration from the table you have most carefully prepared?—Well, the area of Dublin is 5,866 acres, and that is smaller than any of the large towns of England, till we come to Hull, which is 3,633 acres; Leeds has an area of 21,672 acres; Sheffield 19,581 acres; Liverpool 6,210 acres; Bradford 7,221 acres; and Belfast 6,805 acres, much larger than Dublin.

1024. That is important—you say Belfast is 6,800 acres?—Yes; well, the population of Dublin comes fifth in this list, but the area comes about twelfth. I say it comes fifth, but if you add Manchester and Salford (and they are practically one), it is fourth. The towns very much smaller than Dublin, have a very much larger area.

1025. Now, as regards inhabited houses in Dublin, what observations have you to make?—One of the

Effects, one of the disadvantages of having Dublin surrounded or hemmed in by a ring fence is this—the population of Dublin is diminishing instead of increasing. The number of inhabited houses in Dublin is very much smaller than in towns in England that are much smaller than Dublin. In fact, from this table, you will see that there are about ten persons to each house in Dublin, whereas in most English towns there are about five.

1035. Does that arise from the number of roomkeepers in the bad part of the city?—It arises largely from this, that the artisan population are living in what are called tenement houses, once occupied by the richer classes, who are now gone out to live in the townships.

1036. Well, Mr. Pim, does that exercise a prejudicial effect on the health of the city?—I look upon the high death rate of Dublin as almost entirely due to the condition of the houses in which the people are living.

1037. Have you paid any attention to the reduction of valuation in such streets as Henrietta-street, Sun-mill, and Gardner-street?—I have not looked very particularly into individual cases as regards valuation, but the total valuation of Dublin has increased by very little; while in English towns it has been increasing very rapidly. The consequence of this slow increase in valuation (which partly results from our not being periodically re-valued, but is partly the result of our being shut in by the townships)—the consequence is a higher poundage rate, and that discourages people from building in Dublin, and encourages them to go outside and build in the townships. The authorities of the townships are well aware of that, and that it is well to keep down the poundage rate, and keep up the valuation. For a man looks at what his rating is, and it induces him to build in the townships in preference to Dublin, so you have the townships steadily increasing in valuation, and their poundage rate kept down; whereas the Dublin valuation does not increase, and you cannot keep the poundage rate down, because the centre must have more work in the way of wear and tear, &c., than the townships; there is more to be done.

1038. Evidence was given here yesterday of the totally insufficient funds for the maintenance of the roads of Dublin—do you think that arises in some degree from the townships not contributing anything to the repairs of the roads of Dublin—that is, that the roads of Dublin are used by a larger number of persons, and more frequently than by the citizens, and that those persons do not contribute to the maintenance of those roads?—Yes, I think so most distinctly.

1039. Well, when you remember that the townships reap those advantages, which they derive from the city, and bearing in mind their relations to the Corporation and the city, is it not a mere matter of justice that they should contribute towards the rates as well as the city?—Yes, I think so; but when you allow a certain state of things to come into existence on a certain basis you have to deal with vested interests, and you have difficulty in upsetting those interests; this state of affairs ought never to have been established. Of course, if there is to be an amalgamation, the terms of that amalgamation have to be carefully considered. That is a question of detail.

1040. At all events as regards the city roads, are you of opinion there ought to be a contribution by the townships to their maintenance by general taxation or some other mode to be settled, by which they will contribute to the support of the roads?—My view goes towards a complete union. I don't see how you can get a contribution in any other way satisfactorily. Now, the city of Dublin contributes to the maintenance of the Rock-road, and why should the citizens of Dublin be asked to do that, when Rathmines is not asked to contribute to a thoroughfare in Dublin?

1041. Now on the question of the roads, I intended to ask you, as a man having great experience in these matters, what your opinion is as to the question raised in the evidence showing that the funds for the maintenance

of the roads are wholly insufficient—I am not able to go into that question because I have not got it very careful consideration in detail; I can, however, assure that competent opinions have been given to the effect that for our thoroughfares, macadamised streets are wholly unsuited, and that paving is what we ought to have, both for the convenience of the traffic and for the purposes of cleanliness.

1042. And of course you know that paving and keeping in proper order the highways and so on forms part of the sanitary arrangements of a city?—Yes.

1043. Now William-street I believe has been paved altogether?—Yes.

1044. And that is a great improvement to the street?—Yes, and this is not to be forgotten that a great deal of the traffic through William-street is of course traffic going to Rathmines, I mean the heavy traffic now diverted from other streets.

1045. That is one question upon which I wished to obtain your opinion. Have you considered the question of the Fire Brigade, as to the proper organization of the Fire Brigade for the whole city including the townships?—I think there should be only the one central organization with branches. I think the present arrangement is very bad, and I, as a ratepayer of Rathmines, complain very much of the Rathmines Board of Commissioners not having a fire brigade. I complain as a ratepayer of the present system under which the Commissioners ask the Corporation as a master of friendship to send out the brigade to save a house. It is not right I think that Rathmines should expect to get the advantages of the brigade in that way without paying for it.

1046. Are you aware that the organization is an expensive matter?—Yes, to have four different organizations where one would suffice would be a mistake; you would not get the work as well done.

1047. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Heron it is right you should know that we have received a letter from a gentleman, Mr. Owen O'Reilly, of 19 New-row, on the subject of certain house property he holds in the Rathmines township. The letter is as follows—

19, New-row, West, Dublin,
April 9th, 1870.

To the Commissioners of Municipal Boundaries.

GENTLEMEN,—I am owner of considerable house property in the Rathmines township, and if you will permit me to state my opinion on the question of inclosure of this township to the city of Dublin, I am satisfied that it is not only advisable but absolutely necessary. My experience teaches me that the surveying is badly done, that the lighting, especially in the poorer districts, is very bad, and above all that the supply of water is exceedingly bad. I have one house on the main road leading from Kimmage to Harold's-cross for which I receive £45 per annum, and there is not one drop of water supplied to it by the Rathmines Commissioners, although I made frequent applications for a supply during the last three years. The only reply I received being, I must consent to pay a sum of £17 for laying down a public main. I could easily comprehend the meaning of this if the house was in an isolated place—if it was up a lane or an avenue; but no, it is situated on the public highway. I only give you this as an example, for I am of the opinion that there are many houses in the same dire necessity. I may add that there were three large fires in this immediate locality in fact within a few hundred yards of my house, one was the distillery at Greenmount, the next was McHugh's flour mills, and the last Whelan's feed mill, all within a few months of each other, and all this I represented to the Commissioners, but to no purpose. You can easily imagine what would be the condition of the occupants of a dwelling-house if it went on fire without one cup of water on the premises to put it out. Gentlemen, I beg to offer my best apologies for the liberty I have taken.

I am, gentlemen, your humble servant,

O' REILLY.

1048. Mr. Heron.—Now, Mr. Pim, you have considered the question as regards the artisans' dwellings?—Yes.

1049. And as regards the health and improvement of the people?—Yes.

1050. You know of course that the great amount of

BELLE.

April 9, 1870.

Mr. Joseph T. Pim.

DEBATES.
April 3, 1885.
Mr. Joseph T.
Pine.

the building in Rathmines and Fonthill has been performed by Dublin tradesmen for years past—by tradesmen living in Dublin!—Almost the whole of it I should think.

1044. By Dublin tradesmen who live within the present municipal area!—Yes.

1045. Are you of opinion that the townships ought to contribute towards the scheme for the construction of artisans' dwellings?—Yes; I think so most distinctly, for I believe that the artisans' dwellings scheme should be carried out in Dublin on a large scale if you want to improve the health of the inhabitants of Dublin; and I consider the artisans now living in tenement houses in the city are just as much part of the population of the townships as they are of the city of Dublin, and that the townships should contribute to any extensive scheme of artisans' dwellings for Dublin.

1046. Can there be anything worse than this system of room-keepers inhabiting old dilapidated houses in the city of Dublin?—It is as bad as it could well be; and I may just state this in connection with the subject. You will find on looking at Thom's Almanac that at the census of 1871 there were 58,110 families in Dublin. Of these 15,349 families lived six or more families in a house; 17,261 lived four or five families in a house; 12,651 lived two or three families in a house; and only 12,349 families lived in separate houses. Now I believe that is the cause of the high death-rate of Dublin, or at least I believe it to be the chief cause. I believe it to be a worse state of affairs than exists in any of the large towns of England or in the United Kingdom.

1047. In your opinion is it a bad system for health, cleanliness, and for general decency?—It is very bad in every way. It is not merely so for the people who live in those houses, and who die more rapidly in consequence of this state of affairs, but if there be amongst them any infectious disease it is sure to spread amongst themselves, and then to spread to and amongst the ranks of the richer classes.

1048. I may remind you of another matter. Do you know some of those magnificent old houses that are falling into dilapidation, such as those in Henrietta-street and other places, Granville-street, and so on, are they inhabited largely by artisans, and people of that class?—Yes.

1049. Are you aware that they were originally built for noblemen and gentlemen to live in, and that the accommodation of the offices for them were only suited to one family?—Yes.

1050. And of course those offices are altogether unsuited to the enormous aggregation of families?—Yes; those are the houses in which the class of people who now live in the townships used to reside. They have left these houses in the city, and they are wholly unsuited for the purpose for which they are used now, and I say most distinctly that the townships ought to contribute towards the improvement of that state of affairs.

1051. Have you also noticed that the only class of houses built in the townships are good houses, and that there are scarcely any artisans' or labourers' dwellings built there at all?—Yes.

1052. Has that less part of the management of the township?—Yes.

1053. Obviously for the purpose of having a high-class population?—Yes.

1054. Unless some improved scheme of artisans' dwellings is set on foot in this great evil increasing as regards the emigration of the better class people from Dublin, and the occupation of the good old houses by people living as room-keepers?—It is increasing, for as I mentioned the population of Dublin is gradually decreasing—the latter class people are going out.

1055. CHAIRMAN.—Then the decrease is in the upper classes?—Yes.

1056. Mr. Heron.—Have you considered, Mr. Pine, whether, if the townships be amalgamated with the city, the number of the Corporation ought to be in-

creased?—Well, you would have to consider the question of redistribution of representation altogether, and the division into wards; but, I think, that sixty or from sixty to seventy are quite sufficient to form a governing body. Sixty-four is the regular number in England—forty-eight councillors and sixteen aldermen.

1057. Is that the number in Liverpool and Manchester?—I believe it is the number universally adopted.

1058. CHAIRMAN.—Have they sixteen wards?—Not always, sometimes a smaller number.

1059. Mr. Heron.—Then it would apparently seem that the number of members was fixed as being from general experience the best number to be selected?—I am not sure of that, but I fancy it is in the Municipal Reform Act.

1060. But of course the Legislature only tried to carry out the wishes of the local bodies?—I never heard of the local bodies seeking to have the number increased on the ground that they were not able to do the work with the number they had.

1061. In reference to the question of valuation, do you think there should be a general re-valuation?—I think the whole subject should be dealt with on one comprehensive scheme of municipal reform. You must, in dealing with the question, deal with the franchise, the redistribution of the representation, the division into wards, the rate of taxation on the different portions, and re-valuation—re-valuation is essential.

1062. You heard the evidence given about re-valuation, and are aware, of course, that the valuation in the city is stated to be very much under the real value. You are aware that the valuation is all under one set of Acts of Parliament, and ought to be under one system?—Yes.

1063. In the valuation of new houses, of course the valuator puts down an approximate value, to what do you attribute the fact that in Dublin the city is considerably under-valued?—That we don't have a systematic re-valuation. There is no change in the valuation as I understand it, unless a man makes some improvement in his house or unless he says he is being overvalued and applies to have it reduced, and in that way a great many parts of the town have been reduced in the valuation. Then if a man builds a house it is valued at the value of the day, but unless a change is made in the house it is not re-valued, and I say that is extremely unjust; in fact it is a tax on enterprise and a premium on stagnation.

1064. CHAIRMAN.—How is it, Mr. Heron, that these houses in Henrietta-street were reduced in valuation?

Mr. Heron.—The owners applied, and on their appeal the change is made.

Mr. Pine.—There is a right of appeal to have a re-valuation—a reduction of value is made in that way.

Mr. Heron.—Where no structural alteration is made in a house there is no re-valuation. The King's Lane, where the rest of the houses in Henrietta-street were getting their valuation reduced, was reduced from £1,050 in 1854, to £500 in 1855—a reduction of nearly one-half—on the ground that the rest of the street had gone down. The Bonhams got the reduction made.

Mr. Pine.—Practically speaking, the townships are more highly rated, or rated nearer to their real value, than the city. London is revalued every five years on the actual letting value of the houses. The people have to come and give information as to what rent they are really receiving, and the consequence is, that in twenty years, London has doubled its value—I mean the area under the Metropolitan Board of Works, the valuation on which they tax the people, has doubled.

CHAIRMAN.—It has been suggested that you could not carry it out without a general tax for Ireland on account of the income-tax.

1065. Mr. Heron.—Are you clearly of opinion, Mr. Pine, that there should be only one governing body?—Yes; only the one.

1066. With power of uniform taxation?—Well, I won't say uniform taxation. I think that is a question that ought to be considered in detail. I think it very likely the townships may be able to make out a good case for the taxation not being uniform in some cases.

1067. First of all, as regards the Poor-rate, that ought to be the same!—Well, that is not for the Corporation; I am entirely in favour of Union-rating, and the Committee of the House of Commons has reported in favour of Union-rating.

1068. Now, at present, by means of the townships being so lucky as to get special Acts of Parliament, they get water at a cheaper rate than is paid in Dublin!—Yes.

1069. They pay a rent of 3*l*.*d*. to the Corporation, and one pays 4*s*.*t*.—But you know Rathmines does not get the Vartry at all. Pembroke appears to be paying 10*s*.*t*, 7*s*.*t*, and 3*s*.*t*. If I understand it correctly, as a sinking fund I am not quite sure that it relates to water or not, that sinking fund.

Mr. Heron.—I am not informed as to that.

Mr. Pinn.—Well, it does not make the least difference. It is a matter I am not prepared to speak definitely upon now, or to say how it is to be done. The matter ought to be gone into fully in detail, and the details settled by competent authority.

CHAIRMAN.—That is a matter which we have to inquire into. I don't know if you heard the terms of the extended warrant to us under which we are to inquire into the terms on which the townships, or outlying districts are to be, or ought to be added. Therefore, you see that is one of the very things we want to get some information upon.

Mr. Pinn.—There are two points I have formed an opinion upon. The Poor-rates ought to be the same in the townships and in the city. I am in favour of Union-rating; and I also believe the Grand Jury Tax ought to be the same on the townships and the city.

1070. Mr. Heron.—Including county at large charges?—Yes; I don't see what difference there exists in the circumstances of the two as to make the city liability different from the townships.

1071. Then as to the hospitals and lunatic asylums, have you anything to say on that point?—Yes; I fail to see why the city of Dublin should contribute to hospitals to which the people outside send their sick, considering that those people outside escape taxation or contribution. Then, as to the municipal rates, I would like to look into the details of expenditure and other matters before giving a confident opinion or making up my mind as to it. When you come to municipal rates, pure and simple, the difference between Rathmines and the city is reduced very much.

1072. CHAIRMAN.—In Rathmines their general rate is 2*s*, and 4*s*. added for sewer rate. Does the Dublin Improvement Rate correspond to that General Rate in Rathmines?—Yes; it is now 2*s*. 4*d*., the Improvement Rate. I am not clear what the 4*s*. is for, whether for interest on money borrowed or what.

The Fees Clerk.—It is 2*s*. for the removal of house-refuse, and 3*s*. for other sanitary expenses of the department.

Mr. Pinn.—A great deal of the sanitary expenditure is unquestionably in the interest of the township, as well as in the interest of the city.

1073. Mr. Heron.—The Improvement rate for Dublin at present is, I understand, 2*s*. 4*d*.—Yes; improvement and sanitary—3*s*. for removing house-refuse from dwelling-houses, and 3*s*. for the other expense of the Public Health Department, exclusive of sewage. The Rathmines and Pembroke Grand Jury Rate includes everything.

Mr. Walker.—Except poor rate.

1074. Mr. Heron.—Is there any reason why Rathmines and Pembroke should not pay the same improvement rate as Dublin?—No.

1075. The whole municipal rates in Dublin are 4*s*.

6*s*.!—Yes, if Mr. O'Donnell's calculation be correct, and that the result of amalgamation—of adding all the rates together—would be to make the uniform rate 3*s*. 11*d*. in the pound, the result would be a very large increase to the taxation of Rathmines, said but a very small increase to the others. Rathmines manages to spend very little money in rates for sanitary purposes.

1076. I want you, if you can, with that table before you, to try to apply your mind to these different rates. I now call your attention to them, the improvement rate, which is 2*s*. 4*d*., the sewer rate, domestic water rate, public water rate, grand jury rate, and a penny for vestry case abolition rate, that makes the whole to 6*s*.

Mr. Pinn.—Is that for 1879?

Mr. Heron.—Yes.

Mr. Pinn.—The 4*s*. in addition to the improvement rate is in lieu of the Borough rate.

1077. Mr. Heron.—Now, I want to draw your attention to this. Mr. O'Donnell made a calculation showing us that the municipal rates are 4*s*. 6*d*., and that they are much less for each of the townships. The valuation of Dublin is about £400,000, and the valuation of all the townships to be added is £200,000. The valuation of Dublin ought to be increased; but assuming it remains as it is, the result will be that Rathmines, on the 3*s*. 11*d*. rate, will have a large amount of additional taxation!—Yes; the others, practically, will have scarcely any increase worth speaking of.

1078. Now, looking over these rates, commencing with the 2*s*. 4*d*. rate, are any of these rates such as you think the townships—Rathmines for instance—ought not to contribute the full proportion to?—Well, so far as the occupiers are concerned, I should not object to spreading equal rates over all; but, as regards owners of houses, I should like to give thought to some points of detail before giving that opinion. You have allowed people to invest money in land and buildings on the faith of a certain rating and system of Government, and I don't think you can upset arrangements of that kind without giving the subject careful consideration. I don't see my way to it. Now, Rathmines and Pembroke have a main drainage rate. I don't know whether the sewer rate is for it or for the ordinary sewers; but Dublin must have a main discharge rate some time or another, and that is to be taken into consideration as part of the question.

1079. Supposing Rathmines is brought in, the citizens of Dublin will have to pay their per-centages of the interest on the Rathmines drainage as well as the Rathmines would have for Dublin!—Yes, that is one of the terms of the terms.

1080. Would you see anything unfair in that?—No, I do not. Then, Rathmines has no water rate, and I don't think that Rathmines can get on without a water rate, because a great many people there are not satisfied with the present state of affairs, and would be strongly inclined to make a change.

1081. Is the water in Rathmines good?—It is fair enough, but there is a struggle going on on the subject of the water of Rathmines, and if there were an amalgamation of Rathmines with the city they would, I presume, get the Vartry water. You must consider what you are giving as well as what you are getting.

1082. CHAIRMAN.—At present the Commissioners of Rathmines have the water supplied by the Canal?—Yes.

1083. Perhaps they have not got pipes and appliances that would stand the pressure of the Vartry water, and if so, and that they were brought in, I presume there should be new pipes laid down for them by the Dublin Corporation, and every ratepayer in Dublin would have to contribute for that. If that is so, if they get that advantage, would there be anything unfair in asking them contribute to the general cost of the Vartry, particularly where there is an annual

Benson,
April 6, 1879.
—
Mr. Joseph T.
Pinn

DUBLIN,
April 6, 1879.
Mr. Joseph T.
Pim.

sinking fund of £10,000, which in thirty years will pay off the original debt for the Vartry water in Dublin—If Rathmines is satisfied with the quality of the water they have now, I don't see why they should be forced to take any other if they have to pay more highly for it.

1883. CHAIRMAN.—We must all remember that the legislature has endeavoured in the case of the townships to have things done as far as possible which are for the public good. It has been considered, and very properly, that for sanitary purposes and for other reasons, in every town you should get, if you can, high-pressure water—first of all for the purposes of public health and domestic supply, and also for the safety of the place in case of fire. Therefore, Mr. Pim, you cannot always speak of vested interests; something else must be considered, and if nothing were to be regarded in these cases, save and except consideration for vested interests, the legislature would in all probability not have sanctioned the imposition of the 2d. bridge tax over the large area which it did.

Mr. Pim.—All these are undoubtedly matters that must be gone into and carefully considered in detail, and I have not myself gone sufficiently into them to be able to give a definite expression of opinion. I did not, in fact, think that in your inquiry you would go into details as to the terms of a proposed amalgamation.

CHAIRMAN.—We felt the difficulty in these inquiries of the absence of a power to go into the question of the terms, and therefore the warrant has been extended. (The Chairman then read the extended warrant.)

Mr. Heron.—This table has been prepared on what I may call the severest plan against the townships; and it shows a relief to Dublin of £16,000 per annum, and the distribution of it over the townships as the worst thing that could happen to them under an amalgamation.

Mr. Pim.—I have not made this calculation. Is it taken at the present valuation?

Mr. Heron.—Yes.

Mr. Pim.—Because if it was an re-valuation of the whole the difference would not be nearly so great. I think the natural thing would be to amalgamate the whole on the one hand, unless the townships can show a good reason why it should not be done. I would spread the rates equally all round. I should like to look into the matter in detail, and see what value they are getting for the money they are now paying. They may be getting much greater value from the city than now. They would get the fire brigade, for instance; they would get in Rathmines, for instance, high-pressure water, and the Vartry is certainly better in quality than what they are getting now.

Mr. Heron.—The taxation would in the city go from 4s. 6d. down to 3s. 11d., and thereby effect a relief of £16,000, and that would be paid in their proportion by the townships.

1885. Mr. Andrew.—Are you assenting to this statement of Mr. Heron's?

Mr. Pim.—If the document from which he speaks is correctly compiled, certainly. The £16,000 is a smaller difference than I expected, and if you revalue the city, the difference would then be much smaller—scarcely £10,000. I think the 4s. 6d. includes Grand Jury Rate. I would eliminate that, for I would spread the Grand Jury rate at once, and that would reduce it.

Mr. Heron.—You are quite right; the 4s. 6d. includes 8d. Grand Jury rate.

CHAIRMAN.—The Grand Jury rate is 8d. It was stated that 1d. in the pound produces about £2,300. That would be about, say, £17,000 a year paid out of Dublin towards county at large charges, and I see Rathmines pays about £2,000.

1886. Mr. Heron.—Is there any reason, Mr. Pim, why the improvement rate in Rathmines should differ from that in Dublin?—You know I have not gone

through these accounts at all, and I don't know what precisely the improvement rate is spent on.

1887. Mr. Heron.—Cleaning, paving, and lighting.

Mr. Pim.—On the subject of paving, the townships ought to contribute towards the paving of the thoroughfares they use.

1888. Mr. Heron.—And the streets would be paved, cleaned, and watered!—Yes. I say the inhabitants of the townships, who make daily use of the streets, who get value for the expenditure made in the city on these roads—cleaning, repairing, paving, and watering them—should contribute towards that expenditure.

1889. And also to the sanitary arrangements of these streets!—Well, the sanitary arrangements are rather for the people who live in the streets.

1890. CHAIRMAN.—But, Mr. Pim, when you say they ought to contribute to keeping up the streets, do you mean that they ought to pay a per centage, or the same as the persons in the town?—The best plan is to spread the rate equally over all; that is the simplest and the most natural.

1891. That is, in other words, that they should pay the same?—Yes. But, at the same time, there may be reasons shown why they would be unjustly treated by such an arrangement.

1892. Mr. Heron.—4s. 6d. is very small. Now, do you think, Mr. Pim, that there is any reason why they should not pay the same sewer rate as Dublin—that is, 2d. in the pound?—They make their own sewers out of the 2s. improvement rate.

1893. But if that 2s. rate be abolished, and that they come in under the 3s. 11d. rate, is there any reason why they should not pay the same? Should they not pay the same sewer rate as Dublin, under the one central authority, the same as in Paris and London?—The natural and simplest and most convenient way is to spread the rates over all; but I don't know if they may not be able to show, on going into detail, that they may not be treated fairly. I have not gone into that, and, therefore, I cannot say.

1894. CHAIRMAN.—The Dublin valuation comes to £800,000, the Rathmines valuation comes to £100,000. Now, if Rathmines wanted to spend a certain sum of money, say 1d. in the pound, for sewers, if you amalgamate, are you not making Dublin pay 6d. out of the 1d. for their sewers, while Rathmines would only be paying 1d.; on the other hand, Rathmines would only be paying 1d. towards the city, whilst Dublin would be paying 6d. towards the township; therefore, would it not be likely to be a great saving to the Rathmines people?—Yes. The first thing is to decide the question of the advisability of amalgamation at all, and the question of terms ought to be considered afterwards. I am myself not sufficiently up in the details to make up my mind on the question of the details.

1895. Mr. Heron.—But, Mr. Pim, you are clear these ought to be amalgamation?—Perfectly.

1896. CHAIRMAN.—Could you give us your views on this point? If there was an amalgamation effected, are you of opinion that each township should continue to bear its own present debt, leaving Dublin to bear its debts, and that for the future all debts to be incurred should be put on the entire city?—I would amalgamate all the debts. I don't know which way would be easiest, but perhaps it would be better to have all the debts paid out of one common sinking fund.

1897. Mr. Heron.—Are you aware that the city estates produce £16,000 a year now, and may be expected to produce more?—There is no reason why it should not produce more hereafter, and, of course, hereafter the townships would derive the advantage of that.

1898. As to the city debts, you know there is an ample fund to pay all the interest upon the debts?—There is no use in asking me about that for I am not familiar with the city estate or its value, but undoubtedly from time to time it has been producing an increased rental.

1899. Now Mr. Pim have you compared the stan-

DUNNES,
April 3, 1919
Mr. Joseph T.
P.M.

tion of Dublin with those of a number of other large towns—Yes.

1109. In reference to its particular position—I—Yes. I see, in the first place, that the area of Dublin is peculiarly small, and its valuation is peculiarly low, and that makes the poundage rate high. I have got here the assessment to income tax of the large English towns as compared with Dublin, and Dublin stands fourth in that list. Now Liverpool is assessed to income tax to the amount of £15,943,545, and its valuation is £5,010,941, and that is in round numbers one-fifth of the whole assessment to income tax. In Dublin now the assessment to income tax stands at £4,862,382, whilst the valuation is £632,000, so that it is about one-eighth, whereas, as I have pointed out, in Liverpool it is one-fifth of the income. Now the reason I mention this is, you must have a revaluation, and if Dublin was re-valued you would do it with a lower poundage rate, and the increase in valuation would be greater in Dublin relatively than in the townships, for the townships are more nearly valued to the full value, and that would largely, or to a certain extent, rectify the difference between them when you come to the poundage rate. Sheffield has an income assessed to income tax of £1,851,105; Bristol, £8,725,189; but the area of Sheffield is 19,651 ; the area of Dublin is 3,868 acres, the area of Leeds, 21,673 acres, the assessment to income tax of Leeds, £4,674,151, and the valuation £1,033,133. Now the area of Belfast is 6,893 acres, income tax, £2,676,921, and valuation, £489,824, that is about one-fifth. In the English municipal towns the Parliamentary and municipal areas are, in nearly all cases, the same. Manchester is different, but all the other towns have the municipal and Parliamentary areas the same. But if you add the four townships (I do not take Drimacoda)—if you add the four townships to Dublin, you have an area of 8,863 acres, and Birmingham is 8,430, so that Dublin is much the same.

1110. Mr. CORCORAN.—Do you include Clontarf as one of the four—I—Yes—Clontarf, Kilmainham, Fenwick, and Rathmines, and adding the inhabited houses in each of the four townships to Dublin you have only one half the number of inhabited houses as compared with Birmingham. In Birmingham 68,532 was the number of inhabited houses in 1871, whilst in Dublin and the four townships there were only 31,158. The population, too, if you compare Dublin and the four townships with Birmingham will be found 50,000 less in Dublin, where the figure is 246,268, whilst in Birmingham the numbers are 343,787. Now the debt of Dublin is comparatively small compared with Liverpool, Manchester, and other towns. In Liverpool it is £4,663,647 ; in Manchester, £1,707,478 ; in Manchester and Salford, £5,737,463 ; Birmingham, £2,811,824 ; Leeds, £3,376,304 ; Bradford, £2,826,132 ; Salford, £1,028,786, whereas if you add the debt of the townships to Dublin it will give you about £873,033. I have prepared a return showing all this which I hand in.

1112. Mr. CORCORAN.—Do you think that Clontarf should be added—I—Yes ; I don't see why it should not be added and connected with Dublin, and also Drimacoda.

1113. Have you considered as to those portions coloured yellow on the map, which are outside the townships proposed to be taken in by the Corporation—those are portions of the county which they propose to include for the rectification of the boundary—I—There are some portions that ought to be taken in, Dolphin's Barn, for instance. Redbrick is, perhaps, too far. I would go as far as the Metropolitan Police district, Milltown, parts of Grangegorman, Ranelagh, and others. There is a portion there that ought to be taken in, in the road down to Greenfield, Milltown, I think, ought to be taken in.

1114. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any other matter you would wish to mention—I—No.

Cross-examined by MR. ASHURST, Q.C.

1105. I believe, Mr. Pim, you are largely interested in the city—I—Yes.

1106. Are you a member of the firm of Pim Brothers—I—Yes.

1107. One of the most extensive business establishments in the city—I—Yes.

1108. Are you, also, a large shareholder in the South City Markets—I—Yes.

1109. And are interested, I believe, in property not included in these two concerns—I—Yes, some other property. I stated to Mr. Exhume my interest in the city.

1110. Do you consider the existing taxation of Dublin is very heavy—I—Yes.

1111. Do you anticipate any relief from the proposed annexation of the townships—I—Very little relief. I anticipate some from the revaluation.

1112. Then the relief you anticipate is from the revaluation of the city and very little from the annexation of the townships, is that so—I don't think it would save expense in the present difference to Dublin.

1113. Then, Mr. Pim, may I take it as your opinion, you do not think the townships should bear any considerably increased taxation after annexation?—In some cases I think they should bear their full proportion.

1114. Have you in point of fact, Mr. Pim, gone into the question whether in point of fact the townships by what is proposed will be seriously or very little taxed?—They will be taxed more heavily than before, more heavily than now.

1115. Have you formed any ideas as to the extent—I—It depends upon what the rate is now ; it will vary from 1s. to 2s.

1116. Have you had any opportunity of going into the question—I—I have here before me what the taxation is for Killiney and Drumcondra.

1117. That is only since you came into the room, but what I want to know is did you ever go into the question of what additional burden would be imposed on the townships by the proposed annexation?—Do you mean the poundage rate or the total sum?

1118. The total sum ; have you ever gone into it—I—No ; I have not.

1119. Have you ever considered any scheme for the formation of new wards ; to alter the existing wards of the city after the annexation—I—I would reduce the number and amalgamate them.

1120. Have you considered any scheme for the purpose, or are you prepared to offer any suggestion or scheme on the point—I—I would reduce the number on the north side from six to three, and on the south side from nine to five.

1121. Would you make the townships into separate wards, or have you considered the case at all—I—if the ward system is to be continued at all, I would make them separate wards.

1122. Have you considered the propriety of maintaining the ward system—I—I do not like the ward system.

1123. Are you prepared to suggest any other—I—I think it would be better if the Municipal body were elected by the whole body of electors.

1124. Do you see any essential difficulty in amalgamating some of the wards in Dublin, without the annexation at all—I—No, the matter would have to be regulated by Parliament.

1125. Do you see any advantage the annexation would give you, if your sole object was to enlarge and amalgamate the Dublin wards—I—No.

1126. If you were to amalgamate the wards of Dublin, would you enable yourselves to have a more limited governing body than at present—you have now sixty members—I—Of course you could reduce the number, but I would not propose to do so.

1127. And if you wished to reduce the present number of the governing body, do you think you could do it without annexing townships ; do you regard the present municipal management as good—I—No.

DUBLIN,
April 5, 1882.
Mr. Joseph T.
Pim

1128. Would you say that you regard it, not only as bad, but as deteriorating?—It has not deteriorated for the past few years, on the contrary, I think it has rather improved. I think it was for some time deteriorating, but I think it has improved within the past few years; a better class of persons have been elected. There are better business men in the Council now.

1129. Do you recollect having expressed any opinion on the subject when examined before the select committee of the House of Commons in 1866?—Yes.

1130. Was your opinion then that the character of the Town Council had deteriorated since the last Reform Acts, and was consequently losing public confidence?—Yes; I am of that opinion still. From 1851 to 1865 the members were of a higher class than they are at the present day, but there has been a decided improvement within the past five years or so, and I may add that I think the business has been better attended to, and several things have been done leading to decided improvements.

1131. And you think it would be possible still to continue this improvement, even without annexing the townships?—To continue improving the city of Dublin?

1132. To improve the representation and management?—Yes, if you reform the system of franchise, which I would wish to have done.

1133. And in fact I may take it there is no absolute necessity, in order to reform Dublin, to bring in the townships at all, no necessity in order to reform the representation and management?—No.

1134. Now Mr. Pim you have told us generally your opinions as to amalgamation, but you have not spoken of the terms upon which you would amalgamate?—No, not the precise terms, on questions of finance. I have not gone into that.

1135. Would it assist your consideration of the question of amalgamation if you had first considered the terms?—It would not affect my mind in the least.

1136. Then no matter what your view as to the terms you would still consider amalgamation essential?—Yes.

1137. Now you say Dublin ought to be revalued?—Yes.

1138. And do you think it should be revalued even without the annexation of the townships?—Certainly.

1139. Until you come into the room had you ever before you the proposition to include the portions marked yellow on the map and outside the township?—Well I saw that map here a few days ago, but I did not study it.

1140. Had you an opportunity of considering it or studying it at all?—Well, no, I never gave any particular study or attention to it.

1141. I gathered from you that in your opinion the high taxation in Dublin discourages building?—Yes.

1142. Do you, Mr. Pim, consider that increased taxation would encourage building in the townships?—No, I don't suppose it would.

1143. Of course it would discourage it?—That is one of the very things I want to effect or would wish to see effected. I think the present state of things is unjust, and the necessary result of course of increasing taxation in the townships would be to check building and improvements there. It would have the effect of equalising taxation and would not offer special inducements to build houses in one special locality.

1144. But the effect of increased taxation would be to diminish progress and improvement and building in the townships?—For a while, yes, in that particular spot.

1145. Is your view that no matter whether you raise taxation in the townships or not, you in no way check improvements?—In the townships, but I am speaking of the whole area.

1146. But in the townships?—Yes, if you increase taxation in the townships it decreases or discourages by as much, building in them.

1147. Now, Mr. Pim, you have very fairly stated that it is a serious consideration that the townships have expended money on the faith of the continuance of their existing system. The system has grown up with a separate jurisdiction and has been allowed to have the sanction of Parliament, and has continued satisfactorily for a number of years, so that it is a serious thing to attempt to interfere with or disturb it?—Yes.

1148. And you think, too, that it should not be lightly interfered with?—No, it requires great consideration. That is the reason why I am not prepared to state absolutely my opinion on the redistribution of taxation.

1149. Now for anything that has come under your observation the townships may be able to make a case showing just and reasonable objections to the proposed alterations in their constitution and position?—Yes, certainly.

1150. Do you hold any property, Mr. Pim, in the Penrhos township?—No.

1151. Do you live there?—No.

1152. You live at a greater distance than that from Dublin?—Yes.

1153. May I ask where?—In Monkstown.

1154. A good many Dublin people, I mean gentlemen with business concerns and offices in the city, reside there?—Yes.

1155. And in Kingstown?—Yes, and Kingstown.

1156. And I suppose in Blackrock and Booterstown as well?—Yes.

1157. And I suppose they, too, use the Dublin roads and streets?—Yes, to a certain extent, of course.

1158. I suppose large establishments, such as that in which you are one of the principals, would have no objection to the people outside in those places coming in as often as possible?—No.

1159. Even though the wear and tear of the roads would be somewhat increased?—Yes; but the city of Dublin pays for the repair of the road they would use, to help them.

1160. But you have no objection to customers coming and using the roads?—No, because we have a fair claim, as we pay part of the expense.

1161. Would you then propose to include within the municipal area Monkstown, Booterstown, Blackrock, and Kingstown?—No; they are too far off to be satisfactorily managed.

1162. Then you think the taxation the townships would have imposed on them for keeping Dublin healthy, these adjoining places I have mentioned should be exempted from?—They are not exempted altogether. For instance, they have the bridge tax and the police tax.

1163. But for all sanitary expenditure?—Oh, yes, they are exempted, of course, from all city taxation.

1164. Now, have you ever considered exactly where you would draw the line?—No, I have not.

1165. You would draw the line somewhere?—You must draw it somewhere in defining the boundary.

1166. Now, Mr. Pim, do you think the existing municipal expenditure would admit of judicious reduction?—Do you mean by that the money is now wastefully expended or not?

Mr. Andrews—I will put it that way.

Mr. Pim.—No, I do not. I think that since the appointment of the Government auditor they are looked after more sharply than they were.

1167. Do you think that without reducing any option as to whether wasteful expenditure is going on, economy would render the expenditure less and cause it to be reduced?—Wastefulness goes on in other places, even in townships, and an unthrifful economy prevails in Bathstone.

1168. Have you ever thought that the present municipal expenditure should be reduced?—No, I don't think so. I think there are many things on which they ought to spend more money. For instance, the artisans' dwellings.

1169. And that larger expenditure, you think, ought to be imposed to some extent on the adjoining townships?—Yes.

1170. Do you include the artisans' dwellings?—Yes.

1171. And in what way do you consider that Pembroke township would be benefited by the expenditure on the artisans' dwellings scheme?—By improving the condition of the artisans of Dublin and the public health. The artisans of Dublin build most of the houses in Pembroke.

1172. Do you consider, then, that Monkstown and Rostertown would derive benefit from that?—Certainly, and it should be considered whether there should not be a rate in aid from them.

1173. Would you extend it and go as far as Bray?—Well, you may go over the whole of Ireland in that way, but you must draw the line somewhere. I see no reason for drawing that line at the two canals.

1174. Do you see any reason for drawing it at Pembroke?—Well, when you come to the end of terraces of houses, when you come to the end of houses, and are in the country, then the line is almost necessarily a fair one, I think there can be no great difficulty about it.

1175. Then there would be enormous districts outside the line, which you think should be exempted from the burthen?—What burthen?

1176. The burthen of being united to the city of Dublin.

Mr. Pinn.—I do not know if it would be a burthen to them at all.

1177. You consider that Blackrock, Williamstown, Monkstown, and Kingstown would be benefited by the increased taxation, but you do not think they should share any part of the burthen?—I don't say they would be benefited, but I say they do derive benefit from the existence of the city, and every improvement to the city of Dublin is an advantage to those in the neighbourhood.

1178. Then let me understand you—there may be adjoining districts which will be benefited by Dublin improvements, but which should not be taxed?—I don't say they should not be taxed. It is a question whether the Metropolitan Police District ought not to be made to contribute to certain things for the benefit of the city.

1179. Would you by rate in aid or otherwise take in Monkstown and Kingstown, or Blackrock?—Well, as regards the artisans' dwellings and sanitary matters, it would be perfectly fair.

1180. Now, do you regard the crowded state of the dwellings in Dublin for the artisans as the probable cause of the high death rate?—Yes.

1181. More annexation would not cure that?—No, certainly not, unless a scheme of improvement were carried out.

1182. But what that scheme ought to be as regards details and terms you have not been able to consider?—No.

1183. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Andrews asked you about Kingstown, Monkstown, and so on; do you consider that Kingstown or Monkstown derive the same advantages from the Dublin roads than Pembroke or Rathmines do?—No. It is a question of degree altogether.

1184. I make out from your return that there are in the four townships about 7,263 houses, for you give Dublin alone as having 23,596, and Dublin, together with the four townships, as having 31,159; and deducting one from the other you have 7,263?—Yes.

1185. In round numbers, however, about 7,200 houses; and the persons occupying these houses use to a greater or less extent a considerable supply of coal throughout the year?—Yes.

1186. And every bit of it, we may say, is brought from the quays to these townships?—Yes.

1187. Could you form any idea of what the annual consumption is there—would you say there would be ten tons to each house?—I should say between about five and ten tons each.

1188. That would be about 70,000 tons of coal alone?—Yes.

1189. But the people residing at Kingstown or Monkstown cannot be said to draw their supply from Dublin?—No; it is all imported direct to them, I think. Another thing is, the Kingstown people come up by rail and not by road.

1190. I was just going to ask you if the people there used the Dublin streets and roads in the same sense as those residing in the townships do—I think it is really a question of degree, but I think, of course, it does not apply so strongly to Kingstown as to Rathmines and Pembroke; it is a remote degree in the case of Kingstown.

1191. Now, as to sanitary matters, did I understand you to say, Mr. Pinn, that you did not consider the inhabitants of these townships were as much interested in the sanitary question as the city of Dublin?—I meant the actual individual sanitary arrangements of each house.

1192. Oh, yes; but as to the public sanitary arrangements, do you not think it is of great importance that the sanitary arrangements of Dublin should be as nearly perfect as possible, when you consider that the people in the townships use the city so largely every day as you say they do?—Of very great importance.

1193. In addition to the injury to the roads themselves, would not the carriage yearly of say 70,000 tons of coal to the townships, over the streets of Dublin, to their destination, increase the amount of scavenging to be done by the Corporation?—Certainly.

1194. Is it not a great object to the people of Rathmines and the other townships, to have the streets in Dublin kept in good order and well cleaned, and would it not, in fact, be almost a greater benefit to them than to the shopkeepers living in Dublin?—Well, quite as great of all events.

1195. If then, in your opinion, they ought to contribute something towards keeping up the roads, should they not contribute something towards the cleaning and scavenging of the roads and streets?—Most certainly.

1196. Take another thing; we know the great cattle market is at the north side of the city. Do the butchers of Pembroke and elsewhere derive their supply of cattle, sheep, and so on from that cattle market?—Yes.

1197. And must not the driving of the cattle over the streets of Dublin, and the slaughtering of such of them as are slaughtered in Dublin, for the townships, add something, at least, to the amount of sanitary work to be done?—Yes, and they get all that without paying anything for it.

1198. On looking to Rathmines, I find that all the sewers, drains, &c., made under the authority of the Commissioners, by the local taxation returns of 1877, appear to have cost £107. I believe it was only £40 last year. Now, is that, or can it be, a proper amount to be expended out of the rates for that great district or township, valued at nearly £10,000?

Mr. Heron.—£98,000.

Mr. Pinn.—It is certainly very small.

1199. CHAIRMAN.—For sewers and drains, and I find for every other sanitary object the amount put down is £300; and that includes salaries, &c.

Mr. Pinn.—It appears extremely small.

1200. CHAIRMAN.—You were asked by Mr. Andrews about Kingstown and Monkstown not contributing to Dublin. You are aware a bridge tax is levied over the whole Metropolitan District, with the addition of the entire of Clontarf and of Drumcondra. Now, evidently the legislature, when they sanctioned that, must have thought that the bridges of Dublin were for the benefit of all those they allowed to be taxed for them?—Yes.

1201. Well, if the bridges are taxed with that object, is it your opinion that there should be a tax to support the roads leading to those bridges, extending over the entire district?—I don't myself see much difference between the road and the bridge; but then the township keeps up, or ought to keep up, the per-

DUBLIN.
April 6, 1879.
Mr. Joseph T.
Pinn.

BENIN.
April 2, 1887.
Mr. Joseph T.
Pim.

tion of the road that runs through itself. But they don't do that.

1202. CHAIRMAN.—Pembroke pays one-third towards keeping up the Rock-road. Now, suppose the townships were taken in, as you clearly think they ought to be, the bridge tax would remain the same—2d. in the pound; and these enfranchised districts, Monkstown and Kingsdown, would still remain liable to the bridge tax!—Yes.

1203. Now, suppose the townships were taken in, would you be of opinion that these enfranchised districts should pay something as a rate, in aid towards keeping the roads up?—No; I would spend it over the whole Metropolitan District and the other districts over which the bridge tax is collected.

1204. If they are taxed for the bridges, would there be any fair objection, on the same principle, to ask them to contribute to the roads?—No. Take the case of the Metropolitan Board of Works, London, which takes in an enormous area; the people over that large area are taxed to make a new street in the city of London, and it is perfectly fair and right; and the present condition of affairs in Dublin is a matter that concerns the whole district.

1205. Is it not analogous to the fixing of a contributory district for a special sanitary rate?—Yes.

1206. That is, a thing for the benefit of the entire district?—Yes. I don't say a 6d. rate would not be excessive for the whole.

Mr. Heron.—The jurisdiction of the Metropolitan Board of Works extends over 78,000 acres, and over a population of three millions and a half.

Mr. Pim.—In reference to a question of Mr. Andrews, I may say that in Rathmines, where the present rate is lowest, the valuation of our firm is so high in proportion to Dublin, that what we would save in Dublin would not be equal to what we should have to pay in Rathmines, in consequence of the proposed reduction of rates in Dublin and increase of rates in Rathmines.

1207. CHAIRMAN.—I find in Mr. Stokes' evidence that he puts Rathmines down as being one-third below the real value, and Dublin one-half below the real value. He says Rathmines is considerably below the real value. He is asked, "What proportion would you say?" and his reply is, "Perhaps one-third." "What proportion?" he is then asked, "would you say the city of Dublin is below the real value?" and he says one-half.

Mr. Pim.—I think he is right.

1208. CHAIRMAN.—So that if you increased the relative valuation of each, and if Dublin was increased by that one-half, and Rathmines by one-third, they would not be paying the same proportion as the Dublin people?—No.

1209. Now, suppose that the townships were brought in, is it your opinion that the taxation should be borne by the landlord as well as by the tenant?—I hold a strong opinion that all the taxation should be divided between owners and occupiers.

1210. And do you apply that not only to poor rate and sanitary rate, but to other rates?—Certainly, all the rates for permanent improvements.

1211. That is, that if there is a landlord in Dublin, and the tenant goes away and the house is vacant, you think he is likely to get a better rent as the improvement goes on?—Yes. Take the case of the main drainage or the water supply; these are for the permanent benefit of the city, and it is the permanent owners who have the largest interest in it.

1212. Would you carry out in the urban sanitary authority that which is done under the Public Health Act, deducting one-half from the landlord?—Yes, just the same. That would all have to be arranged. That, I believe, has been recommended by the Local Taxation Committee in England, and it is the Scotch system for roads and bridges.

1213. Would you be at all in favour of leaving these townships as they are—that is, with their own body to manage them, and that they should pay a rate in aid,

as a contribution from them for the taxes of Dublin, the improvement of its streets and its sanitary condition, the artisans' dwellings, and so on?—Would you be in favour of a scheme of that kind, leaving the townships to manage their own affairs?—No; I would prefer a complete system of amalgamation. I think we would have the advantage of having, as members of the Corporation of Dublin, some of the members of the Board of Commissioners of these townships.

1214. In view of that, do you think the Corporation, with their present number, and with the likelihood of their getting in more of business—some of the Town Commissioners—would be able to carry on the work of Dublin and of the townships?—I see no reason why they should not, just as the Corporations of Manchester or Liverpool or Leeds do. I don't think it is a question of numbers, but rather of quality, doing the work. The work is much the same class. It does not take a larger number to do it. So far as the commissioners are concerned, they have the different departments of work under their management, and under the new system they would be able to do the same work, but the staff of officials might fairly be increased!—Oh, yes.

1215. With men better paid and competent to do the work well?—Yes.

1216. Now, as to the wards, Mr. Pim, there are fifteen at present?—Yes.

1217. How what arrangement would you propose or suggest, suppose these townships were taken in? You say, I think, that you would reduce the number in the city at present?—Yes, in the north side from six to three, and in the south from nine to five.

1218. That is, you would reduce the city wards from fifteen to eight?—Yes, and then add seven wards from the new districts.

1219. That is, you would give seven wards to the townships?—Yes. The representatives might be chosen partly in relation to population and partly in relation to valuation. The numbers of representatives for each ward need not necessarily be the same.

1220. Well, you know the valuation of the wards differs very much—some are £40,000, others are very much. Would you re-distribute the wards, according to their valuation, as nearly as possible?—Between the valuation and the population.

1221. Would you be in favour of forming the present townships into separate wards, with a lesser number of representatives, or would you give the same number you have at present to each ward?—I don't know how the townships would divide up into wards—perhaps two wards in Rathmines and two in Pembroke, and one in Clontarf and one in Kilmainham.

1222. The valuation of Dublin is close on £400,000; the valuation of the townships at present is about £200,000. Well, would you be in favour of or would you consider it right to give Dublin three times the number of representatives on the Corporation you would give the townships?—The population of the townships together is somewhat about 40,000; the valuation of the townships at present is something about £300,000, so that the population is about one-fifth of the whole and the valuation about one-fourth of the whole.

1223. CHAIRMAN.—Rather more. Now take sixteen to be the number of the representatives in the Corporation, how would you propose to re-distribute them?—Well, you could give one-fourth to the townships.

1224. Would you put them into separate wards and give them one-fourth of the representation, or would you add on portions of it all to the existing wards? You could not well add them on—in some you could, but in others you could not.

1225. Suppose, then, you put them all into one family, would you then divide and say we will give you a certain number, we will make the number of wards fifteen still?—You are not bound to have the same number of wards at all.

1227. What alteration would you suggest. You know this is a subject, the arrangement or re-distribution of the wards, upon which we must report—Well, I have not worked it out. I would take the population and valuation together and see how they would compare. There is one thing you should consider—the growth of the town will be in the outlying portion more than in the centre—so you might give too large a proportion to the outlying districts, that will be rectifying itself every day.

1228. You believe that not only numbers but property should be represented, would you give the larger number of representatives in proportion to property, more than to the poorer districts of the city?—At the time that Dublin was divided into wards, they had an idea of dividing it in proportion to the valuation, and to give a larger representation in proportion; but then the valuation has been modified so considerably since then, it does not exactly work. The wards in England, in the English towns, do not all send in the same number of representatives; some return six, some eight, and some three, according to the size of the wards.

Mr. Berridge (the Town Clerk)—I wish to add a word or two to my evidence with reference to the terms upon which the gas is supplied to the city. I stated yesterday the cost from recollection, but without further data, and I have since sent for the books and find that the cost of public lighting service for the year 1878, inclusive of lamplighters' wages, &c., was £10,463 13s. 2d.; the number of public lamps was 3,533; the cost per lamp per annum was £3 11s. 4d. Take, then, the amount we paid to the gas company—we pay our own lamplighters—the cost of gas supplied to the public lamps, exclusive of the lamplighters' wages, was £8,091 14s. 3d., and that would give a cost per lamp of £3 11s. 7½d. for last year. The company has reduced the charge by 3d. per 1,000 cubic feet since the 1st of January.

1229. Mr. Corriss.—To the public?—Yes; the cost of gas supplied to the public lamps (exclusive of charge for

gas) in the year 1878 was £8,311; less proposed reduction of 3d. per 1,000 cubic feet would be £461 14s. 8d., or $\frac{1}{2}$ of present charge, or £2 9s. 0½d. per lamp.

1230. CHAIRMAN.—By the terms of your contract as they reduce the price of gas to private consumers, do you get the advantage of the reduction?—Yes; it is proportionate. I have seen the cost of gas in a house in Rathgar, in 10, Garville-avenue, and I find the amount consumed was 30,000 feet; and as the householder has to pay 3d. more than he would have to pay if he resided in the city boundary, that makes the charge 3s. 1½d. The valuation of that house, although the rent is £70, is only £37, and that comes to an additional tax practically of 3d. in the £, which the consumer would not have to pay if he had the same advantageous terms as a citizen living within the present boundary.

1231. If the boundary were extended would the Gas Company be bound to give the gas at the reduction to the districts brought in. If you extend your lamps in Penicuik and all these townships are the Corporation to give the benefit of it, and is the Company to give you the benefit of this reduction of 3d. in the 1,000 feet?—I take it we could bring some pressure on the Company under the contract.

1232. Of course you would try to do your best for the people outside?—Yes, undoubtedly; we believe the advantages of such a large contract should be extended to the greater boundary.

1233. Yes; but the Gas Company might say—well, the leakage is so much greater in such an extended area that we must charge something extra for it!—Well, I don't know any place where a company charges different rates within the same municipal area.

1234. CHAIRMAN.—We can easily ascertain whether in Liverpool and other towns in England the districts brought in get the gas for the same terms as the parent town.

Mr. Heron.—Invariably they do.

Mr. JOHN CURTIN examined by Dr. FORSEED.

1235. You have been City Treasurer for some time?—Yes.

1236. Previously to your appointment you were in that department for some years?—Yes.

1237. I wish just at present to ask you about the city estate. What is the amount of the present income?—£13,000 a year is about the net amount received for the year ending 31st of August, 1878.

1238. CHAIRMAN.—What is the exact amount?—£18,315.

1239. Dr. FORSEED.—You were examined before the Local Government Board Commissioners on the question of the estate?—Yes, I was.

1240. And you then gave an estimate of the probable increase in the estate by the falling in of leases and the re-letting of the property?—Yes; but the evidence I gave on that occasion was based on information derived from the late Law Agent to the Corporation, Mr. Francis Morgan, and the conclusions were not independently arrived at by any investigation I had made.

1241. You have since then considered the question fully and carefully?—I have.

1242. Before we go to that estimate perhaps you would mention to the Commissioners what different properties belong to the Corporation—some are urban and some are rural?—The first property I may mention is that called the Antient Revenue; you will find it mentioned at page 54 in the account. That was an estate granted under charter, the Antient Revenue and All Hallows. There is fully 2,658 acres of All Hallows, and the remainder is made up of city property.

1243. CHAIRMAN.—Just tell us what the amount is of Antient Revenue and city estate?—The annual

rent of property enclosed within the city is £9,867, the Antient Revenue—All Hallows—is £6,023. That is the amount of the two half-years.

1244. Mr. COTTON.—All Hallows is in the county—partly in the county and partly in the city?—It is. The next estate is St. Mary's Abbey.

1245. Dr. FORSEED.—What is the rent of that estate?—£1,452—I am speaking of the rental of 1878.

1246. And the next?—St. George's estate.

1247. That is city estate?—Yes.

1248. What is the rental?—£168.

1249. CHAIRMAN.—What is the total amount?—£17,678 10s., including Baldyley quarterly rents.

1250. Does that comprise all the city estate?—Yes; but there are what are called Baldyley town lots beside the town of Baldyley—weekly tenancies also included.

1251. What does that come to?—That is £208 7s. 6d. from weekly tenancies. The gross total is £17,887 2s. 6d.

1252. Now, what about the Kildare estate?—The Kildare estate is included in All Hallows.

1253. Dr. FORSEED.—Now, what is the gross total of the estates at present?—We have added, or we will have added to that figure on the 31st of August, an increase of £1,000 at least.

1254. Mr. COTTON.—From leases falling in, do you mean?—Yes; leases that have just fallen in.

1255. Dr. FORSEED.—There is one portion of the city estate in Grafton-street, Suffolk-street, Westmoreland-street, Dame-street and College-green. The present income, I believe, is £329?—Quite so.

1256. What do you estimate as the probable increase to that upon the re-letting?—The valuation being £2,530, I have measured statu per cent. to be added to the valuation, as in all probability the value it will

ECCLESIA.
April 6, 1878.
Mr. BERRIDGE,
Town Clerk.

Mr. John
Curtis.

BIRMINGHAM,
April 8, 1882
Mr. John
Curtis.

realise in 1880, and after deducting the present rents we will receive a net increase of £3,061.

1257. In point of fact, the Corporation would be deriving the occupation rents, and not the head rents?—Yes. I may mention in connexion with that what is very remarkable evidence on the point of indicating the increase we are likely to receive from that property; for instance, Messrs. Hodges, Foster, and Co., propose to give £270 for their holding at present valued at £135, so you have an increase there of one cent per cent. Alderman Measen has been accepted under a consent from the Lord of the Treasury for £286, the present valuation being £140. The present rent we derive in each case is £32.

1258. Dr. Newwood.—Your calculation adding sixty per cent. is a safe calculation I—I think so; it is based on fair premises.

1259. Is there any other portion of the city estate about to fall out?—There is, the Clifton estate.

1260. State the circumstances of that—the present rent derivable from it?—The present rent the Corporation derive is £16 18s. 6d. per annum.

1261. I believe that estate extends from Arran-quay Chapel to the Royal Barracks, and back to Smithfield?—It does.

1262. To whom was it leased?—To one Thomas Ellis.

1263. Now represented by I—By Lord Clifton.

1264. That is a very old lease?—199 years.

1265. It falls in in 1881?—In 1881.

1266. What do the Clifton family receive?—£1,725 per year.

1267. What is the valuation?—The valuation is £2,336, as furnished by Birmingham and Gales.

1268. What do you estimate as the fair increase that may be anticipated on the realising of that estate?—I have given that subject much consideration, and I am strongly of opinion that it is undervalued, and that £800 should be added to the valuation.

1269. That is to the valuation of £5,336?—Yes; and for these reasons: It is very dilapidated as respects many of the houses, but at the same time a large portion of the property which is in the occupation of 125 tenants, is in very good condition.

1270. It is as a business part of the town?—And so on an average I should say it will realise £3,000.

1271. Extends Arran-quay, Ellis's-quay, and Queen-street?—Yes.

1272. The houses are let by the Clifton trustees?—For sixty, and fifty, and thirty-one years.

1273. CHAIRMAN.—But those leases will fall in?—Yes.

1274. Dr. Newwood.—What about the Ballyallen estate?—That is landed property in the country—part and parcel of the All Hallows estate.

1275. CHAIRMAN.—When does it fall in?—In March, 1880.

1276. Dr. Newwood.—Eight hundred and six acres, I believe?—Yes.

1277. What is the present rental?—The present rental from Ballyallen is £204.

1278. CHAIRMAN.—Give us the increase?—The valuation of Ballyallen and other landed property falling in is £800, according to Griffith. The present rent is £204.

1279. I suppose you may take it that there will be an increase there of £600 a year?—In 1881; the summary estimate is £20,580—that is, taking the rental of the 31st of August last, with the additions.

1280. Dr. Newwood.—That includes Grafton-street, the Ballyallen estate, the Clifton estate, and some other property?—Yes.

1281. Mr. COTTON.—An increase of £7,000 a year?—I think it will exceed that.

1282. Dr. Newwood.—There are a number of leases for lives outstanding?—Yes.

1283. Some for one and some for two lives; what is the anticipated increase from the property so situated?—That has not been measured by any person; but having regard to the fact that the property is situated in the very best part of the town—Grafton-street and

about that neighbourhood—and that the valuation is set down at £6,325, that the net rental the Corporation derive is £2,023 a year, I should say that the increase at the end of twenty or twenty-five years, when all the lives, or the majority of them, will have dropped, will be very considerable, indeed—£10,000 a year, perhaps. £284. That is in addition to the £25,580?—Yes.

1285. Recently the expenses for military purposes have been transferred from the Borough Fund to the Improvement Fund under the Local Government Board here?—Yes.

1286. That relieves the city estate of between £3,000 and £4,000 a year?—Yes, fully £4,000 a year.

1287. And taking it from rents?—Yes.

1288. CHAIRMAN.—In 1881 you will have £25,500?—Witness.—Yes, from rents £25,500; and the average payments are measured between £19,000 and £20,000 at present.

1289. Dr. Newwood.—The surplus balance will be?—About £7,000. Adding to that a miscellaneous income derived from the Borough Fund of about £6,800 a year, it would make an available balance at the end of each financial year if no heavy debts were incurred—which is not likely to take place—of somewhere between £10,000 and £11,000, for any purpose the Corporation chose to apply it to. Further, if the property producing gross rents £25,500 a year, and miscellaneous receipts £4,800, or in all £30,300 a year, were sold at twenty-five years' purchase it would realise £700,000 and upwards in 1881, nearly the whole debt of the Corporation at present.

1290. CHAIRMAN.—You could hardly get twenty-five years' purchase for houses in Grafton-street?—I think we could.

1291. Dr. Newwood.—They sold some property, with the leave of the Lord of the Treasury, to the Hibernian Bank at College-green and Church-lane?—They did.

1292. What was the purchase money?—£13,000. That is twenty-two-and-a-half years' purchase. That was some years ago, when property was not all of the value that it is now. I may add that the Corporation purchased in the public market over £16,400 worth of City Debentures, and effected a saving for the city by the difference of interest payable on the debentures and the amount of rent they had been in the habit of receiving of about £100 a year.

1293. Is the rent a well-paid rent?—I consider that it is. There are not much arrears.

1294. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose it is all well paid except that of the weekly tenants at Ballylough?—Yes, quite so. If you were to sell the city estate, and pay off the debenture debt on the Borough Fund, amounting to £198,000, you would have a balance available of £440,000. That £440,000 is half the debt of the Corporation at this present moment; but if we sold off the £4,800 a year miscellaneous receipts in addition it would reduce the debt of £884,000 to about £150,000.

Mr. O'DONNELL.—Including the old debt.

1295. Dr. Newwood (to witness).—Then I gather from the statement you have made that the Borough Fund is amply sufficient for the payment of all charges upon it, and to leave a considerable balance?—Yes, more than amply sufficient.

1296. You heard Mr. O'Donnell's evidence as to the Borough Fund—do you agree with it?—I do.

Cross-examination of Witness by Mr. ANDREWS, Q.C.

1297. What is the present net increase of the Corporation rental?—I have not the particulars.

1298. State it in globo?—About £1,010 a year.

1299. That is an increase of what?—Of the rental as it stood on the 31st of August last.

1300. CHAIRMAN.—That would make it about £19,300?—Yes.

1301. Mr. ANDREWS (to witness).—Be kind enough to give me the anticipated increase up to 1881.—About £6,500; but I expect it will be more than that.

1302. In 1881 how much more will you have?—£6,500.

1303. What is your next period after 1881?—Well, after 1881 we will have many leases falling in. I have

not looked into the subject, but leases of one and two lives will be dropping year after year.

1305. Do these leases all bear the same date?—I will give you an idea of it. They are for terms of years. The last renewals were made in 1843, and previous.

CHAIRMAN.—I thought you said lives?

1306. Mr. Andrews.—Are they terms of years dependent on lives?—Yes, terms of years dependent on lives.

1306. Give me the dates of the leases?—The dates of the last renewals are 1817 and 1830, and onwards.

1307. Have you formed an opinion—I don't care whether it is very accurate or not—as to when these leases will run out?—In about twenty or twenty-five years from this. The leases are almost all old leases.

1308. At the end of twenty or twenty-five years how much will you have over and above any increase up to 1861?—I should say fully £10,000 a year.

Re-examination of witness by Dr. Newwood.

1309. Have you got a schedule of the leases with you, showing the ages of the leases?—I have.

Mr. O'DONNELL re-examined by Dr. Newwood.

DEBATE.
April 5, 1878.
Mr. John
O'Connell.

Witness.—I beg to hand in the returns you asked me for, apportioning the rate over the whole district. (See Appendix No. 12.)

1310. Mr. Walker.—Is that the 3d. 11d. rate?—The 3d. 11d. d.

1311. Dr. Newwood.—What is the next return?—It is a return of existing liabilities with respect to loans made up to the 3rd of April, 1878. (Appendix No. 7.) I give you it in a summary, and then I show each liability; also, with respect to Lloyd's Bonds, the amount paid off since the 31st of August, 1878, is shown. The next return is a statement showing the total amount of interest payable by each fund. I wished to state that the amount of interest payable by the waterworks fund is £28,928 7s. 2d., and not £30,000, as I stated yesterday. I am now giving the exact amount. The interest on the Borough Fund date and the interest on the Improvement Fund debt and the Castle Market bonds are given in the return.

1312. CHAIRMAN.—You say in the return "balance due on Economic Hand in Hand Insurance Company." Are you paying that off?—We pay off £2,000 a year mainly to that Company. We have power to release the debentures, and we have re-issued them.

1313. Then you have not specifically reduced that?—No. The loans remain the same, but I show in the return the amount due and the amount re-issued. The next is a statement connected with the Fire Brigade department, showing the rates and the payments on account of that department from 1862 to the 31st of August, 1878. (Appendix No. 15.)

1320. 1862 was the first year?—It was.

1321. Explain that?—I showed the receipts for each year from 1862 up to the 31st August, 1878. These total receipts amount to £51,090 12s. 4d., and the total payments during that period amounted to £49,275 1s. 9d.; the difference being a surplus arising over all these years.

1322. That stands to the general credit?—It is in the general fund for the Fire Brigade purposes if necessary.

1323. When the Fire Brigade goes outside the city with the consent of the Lord Mayor is there any payment made?—There is. I believe we have power to charge to a certain extent.

Mr. J. P. BYRNE examined by Mr. Heron, Q.C.

1328. I am a member of the Town Council of Dublin, and a magistrate and a grand juror for the County of Dublin.

1329. Have you paid attention to the business of the Town Council by acting on some of the committees?—Yes, I have.

1330. The charges upon the Borough Fund are being paid off year after year?—They are.

1331. CHAIRMAN.—How are they being paid off year by year?—We are taking up the city debentures every year.

1332. How much did you take up last year?—£500 from Hibernian Bank. We also took up thirty-nine debentures last year, with proceeds of sales of property.

1333. That is you have lessened the debt by £3,900, and £300; by £4,400 in all, that year.

1334. Dr. Newwood.—With respect to what is known as the debt of 1819, is there not an annual discharge of £500 at least?—There is. It will be wiped out at the end of a given number of years.

1335. CHAIRMAN.—Are there any other of the debts being paid off year by year except the waterworks instalment of £10,000 a year?—The Improvement Fund debt is being paid off by instalments of £1,000 and £1,000 a year each, the total debt was about £75,000, which is being annually reduced, but the accountant will answer these questions with more precision than I can.

Mr. Thomas
O'Donnell.

Mr. CORCORAN.—Captain Ingram said they got nothing from Rathmines.

CHAIRMAN.—In the Rathmines account there is a payment of £9 for the Corporation fire engine.

Dr. Newwood.—That was paid by the Insurance Company, the fact being that through the Corporation had the fire and in justice ought to have received that sum for extinguishing the fire, Captain Ingram stated—"I don't know the fact that they have never up to the present moment received a farthing of their expenses."

Mr. Neale.—It was repudiated. The Insurance Company repudiated all claim.

CHAIRMAN.—It is not the Insurance Company. The question is whether the township pays.

1324. Mr. Neale (to witness).—Did the townships pay anything at all?—To the best of my belief they did not; but you had better ask Captain Ingram.

1325. Mr. Corcoran.—Mr. O'Donnell, I believe the receipts from the Fire Brigade are never likely to be less than they were in 1878!—No. They will be as much in future, because they will have the advantage of an improved valuation. They are entitled to three halfpence in the pound off the public water rates, whatever that produces. They have got that since 1874.

Dr. Newwood.—Under the Waterworks Act of 1861 it was three halfpence for ten years up to 1871. It was then reduced to a penny. That was found to be too little, and under an Act obtained by the Corporation in 1874 the halfpenny was restored. There is one other notice. The Fire Brigade expenditure for the city of Dublin is likely to be higher than it was in 1878, because there will be other men charged for.

1326. Mr. Corcoran.—In future there will be £3,500 a year at least available for Fire Brigade purposes!—Well, I should say so.

1327. Mr. Neale.—The Fire Brigade has always cost about £3,100 a year!—Having regard to the dropping of the halfpenny during ten years, and the wages of the additional men employed, the general result is that the Fire Brigade has cost about £3,100 a year.

Mr. Corcoran.—It could be increased to £3,600 without any liability.

Mr. J. P.
Byrne.

1330. Which committees?—I am chairman of No. 1 Committee, and I was chairman until about a month ago of the General Purposes Committee. I resigned the General Purposes Committee from over duty.

1331. Have you also been chairman of the Board of Guardians of your union?—Yes. I have acted for a

DUBLIN,
April 5, 1879.

Mr J. P.
Byrne

great many years in that capacity in the Rathfarnham Union.

1332. CHAIRMAN.—No. 1 Committee takes charge of the street—Yes; all the paving, lighting, and cleansing.

1333. Mr. HERON, Q.C.—Are you in favour of an enlargement of municipal boundaries?—I am, and was for long before I became a member of the Corporation.

1334. How far, in your opinion, ought the boundaries to be enlarged?—As soon as the queries came from the Commissioners the whole subject was referred to the General Purposes Committee, and received from them a great deal of their consideration, and the opinion at which I arrived, in concurrance with that committee, was that the Townships of Pembroke, Rathmines, Kilmainham, and Drumcondra should be attached. I believe there is an identity of interest and character between these townships and the city, and, therefore, I consider it absolutely necessary that they should form a portion of the municipality. I also think that their close proximity to the city gives them city advantages for which they ought to take a share of the responsibility. At present they take no responsibility.

1335. Have you considered the question of adding small portions to the township, so as to form a regular boundary?—The mere number of detail did not come before the committee, but we considered that a boundary ought to be formed. I may say that the committee did not think it necessary to go into matters of mere detail.

1336. You know Dublin a great many years—it is a city at present practically built up to the full extent of the municipal boundary?—Yes, that is my opinion. There is an area in Dublin unbuilt and which is not at all likely to command the attention of speculators in building. Practically, the best portion of the present unoccupied area is built on. There is a district in the neighbourhood of the South Union Workhouse, or Richmond Lunatic Asylum, which I think gentlemen fond of building would專特點 in.

1337. For some time has the building of first-class houses in any numbers in Dublin practically ceased?—I think the building within the area of Dublin at present consists of second and third-class houses. The first-class houses are all being built outside that area.

1338. Where?—Principally in Pembroke and Rathmines townships. Recently houses of a very good class have been built in Drumcondra, but they don't quite come up to the houses in the other two townships.

1339. Have these first-class houses in Pembroke and Rathmines been built for the most part by independent wealthy citizens and merchants of Dublin?—Certainly.

1340. And supposing Dublin were not here would one of these houses have ever been built at all?—Manifestly they have been built because of the attractions that suburbs offer to the citizens to go outside.

1341. Do you remember these townships before this great extent of building took place?—I do not, but I have been obliged to take some trouble in collecting statistics with respect to these townships.

1342. You know them?—Yes.

1343. Do you know what their valuations were some twenty or thirty years ago?—I took an active part in connexion with the County Grand Jury business in reference to the Rock-road, which had been a very sore thorn with the County Grand Jury. In the year 1844 the Act 7th & 8th Victoria, chapter 106, was passed. That Act adjusted the city and county boundaries; and section 17 provided that in consequence of the great thoroughfare on the Rock-road of the barony of Dublin, and owing to the smallness in valuation of the area corresponding to what is now Pembroke township, the adjoining barony of Rathdown and the City of Dublin should each contribute one-third each of the cost of the repair of that part of the Rock-road

which passes through said barony of Dublin, now Pembroke township. There has been since a strong feeling on the part of the Grand Jury that this state of things should be altered, and there has been a great desire to assist the Corporation, but they believe that it would be necessary to get an Act of Parliament, in order to deal with the altered circumstances.

1344. What are the altered circumstances?—I cannot ascertain what the valuation of Pembroke township was in 1844, at the time that Act passed. The best record we have on the subject is found in account books of 1853, according to which the valuation of Pembroke township was £12,413. Making a reasonable allowance for the progress of that township during the ten years, you could not put down its valuation in the year 1844 at more than one-third of the amount of the present valuation, and that would be about £37,000 or £38,000. The Bill to which I allude declared, that, owing to the smallness in valuation of the area of that time, the city of Dublin and barony of Rathdown were to be made chargeable with that share of the expense of the Rock-road. Now, the valuation is £69,000, and the Rock-road people receive the same contribution as they did when it was only one-third of that amount.

1345. CHAIRMAN.—Is much of the road within the township?—It is all within Pembroke township except about 100 or 200 yards. The contribution is still one-third, notwithstanding the altered circumstances, the railways, and the canals which have been made since.

1346. Have you anything further to say with respect to the altered circumstances of Pembroke township?—I think not, except on the question of rating.

1347. Is Rathmines, at this moment, substantially part of the city of Dublin?—It is substantially a part of the city of Dublin. No stranger would know the difference between the one and the other. The mere name of the canal is nothing.

1348. Kilmainham and Drumcondra are not in as good a locality for building as Pembroke and Rathmines?—We thought that although Kilmainham and Drumcondra are not so directly connected in the building as the others, yet that the same principle should be applied all round the city.

1349. You are not in favour of naming Clontarf?—The question of Clontarf was brought forward and warmly discussed in the committee, and we divided upon it. I admit I was in a majority, still we were anxious if Clontarf had any claims to give them the benefit of it. Clontarf is joined to Dublin by a neck of land at Annestown bridge; beyond that is an area of arable land which is part of the demesne of Lord Charlemont; further, Clontarf is not of very large valuation, coal ships come in there, and it is, in fact, a rural district, deriving its supplies from the adjoining farmers who live around.

1350. In reference to the houses in Dublin, are you aware that according to the last census, Dublin has 25,000 houses?—Yes.

1351. It is stated in the census that 1,000 of them were unoccupied?—Yes.

1352. Practically, has not the building of new houses in Dublin almost ceased?—The building of new houses in Dublin has almost ceased. It has not been at all equal to the requirements of the city. In the locality of the Liberties, the Gresham, and other places, dilapidation is going on very rapidly, and no provision has been made for the class of people who occupy those houses.

1353. In reference to the progress of dilapidation, is it the fact that any number of streets and houses are now being allowed to go into decay?—From the valuations existing at present it appears that Henrietta-street was, in 1854, valued at £9,280 a year, and that in 1879 it was valued at £1,040; that Granville-street, close to Mountjoy-square, in 1854, was valued at £640, and in 1879 at £233; that the valuation of Blackhall-street, in 1854 was £623, and

that in 1879 it is only £480; that Buckingham-street was, in 1854, valued at £740, and in 1879 at £457; that Gloucester-street, in 1854, was valued at £1,031, and in 1879 at £1,330; and that Lower Dorset-street was valued at £2,773 in 1854, and at £2,096 in 1879. These were the only streets that I dealt with, and on the total of six streets I found that there was, in 1854, a valuation of £9,087, and in 1879, a valuation of £6,278, an enormous dilapidation in six streets, the same will be found to exist in Dorset-street, Elmington-street, Summerhill, Mosktenburgh-street, Temple-street, and Marlborough-street, I had no opportunity of going to the south side at all.

1354. CHAIRMAN.—Do you attribute this to any class of persons who used to reside in those streets having gone to the country?—I really do. Long before I entered the Corporation, I attributed it to the same cause, namely, to men who used to reside in those houses, and who followed business or professional avocations, going out to the suburbs, and retaining only their offices in town; the result of which was that the houses were converted into tenements and shops.

1355. Mr. CORROX.—Were these reductions of valuation the result of personal applications?—It could not be otherwise, according as I construe the Act of Parliament. In the event of an improvement there is an arbitrary notice taken by the Collector-General; and in the event of dilapidations, no alteration is to be made in the valuation except at the request of the occupier. I may again say that the occupiers are sometimes slow and indifferent in acting in the matter. If it were dealt with on a fair basis, an enormous quantity of the city would be immensely reduced in valuation.

1356. Mr. HERON.—Up to the last moment the landlords tried to keep up the valuation!—Of course he does.

It is only by dire necessity the valuation is reduced.

CHAIRMAN.—Because as long as they are unoccupied they pay no rent.

1357. Mr. HERON (as witness).—In addition to that, have you taken any illustration from Dame-street?—Yes; I took Dame-street with the view of seeing what I could make out of it as being the most populous street in Dublin. I found that the valuation of Dame-street roughly totalled up to £9,000 a year. With my very best efforts, and with the assistance of the Town Clerk, we could not make out a single resident in Dame-street as being named in the Directory. Of course there is somebody in all the houses, but a vast number of parties named as having premises in Dame-street, live out in the townships. There are several offices occupied by leading men of the city. There is the Chamber of Commerce, occupied by men of different professions. All the men of business who have offices in Dame-street, notwithstanding the splendour of these houses, don't live in them.

1358. Opposite the Bank of Ireland there is an immense corner range of offices where some of the leading professional and mercantile men have offices. Is there not a very small valuation of that range?—Yes, there are seven or eight gentlemen, brokers and others, who have offices there, and all of whom live out of town.

CHAIRMAN.—There are the Leinster Chambers in which there are four tiers of offices.

1359. Mr. HERON.—The valuation of that house I believe is £1601.

Witness.—I am not aware. Of course as we know nearly every one of those gentlemen pays for his office.

1360. CHAIRMAN.—According to the evidence of Mr. Stokes, given before the Select Committee, not one of those gentlemen who have offices in the Commercial Buildings are rated, they having actually got themselves removed from being juries of the city in order to carry on their business there and live outside.

Witness.—I believe the whole Commercial Buildings are valued at about £500.

1361. CHAIRMAN.—Not one of the gentlemen who have offices are rated, and whatever may be rated, the building is let into these tenements.

Witness.—A large amount of the wholesale trade of Dublin is done in the Commercial Buildings; tea, sugar, wine, and all those things are sold there.

1362. Mr. HERON.—That's an illustration as regards the most prosperous portion of the city. Now, with respect to the Coombe, is the process of dilapidation going on there?—I think there is scarcely any room for further dilapidation there, it has gone to such an extreme. It is the district which the Artisans' Dwellings movement deals with, and I believe the valuation of the houses there is something very trifling. The houses are occupied by a wretched tenantry. Some parts of the Coombe are not quite so bad,

1363. In your opinion has there been at all times in Dublin a want of properly-constructed artisans' and labourers' dwellings?—Yes; and in consequence the artisans and labourers of Dublin have been driven to the necessity of occupying tenements. There has not been that class of houses which would make them comfortable and the city healthy. It is a well-known fact that the owners of tenement houses are a class of men who care neither for the comfort of their tenants nor for the preservation of the property, so as they get the rent from the people in the houses, and, as a rule, the houses are kept in a wretched state.

1364. CHAIRMAN.—Are you of opinion that an improvement in the sanitary condition of the lower classes of citizens would improve the health of the upper classes?—I think that the health of the upper classes is certainly not safe if that of the lower classes is in danger.

(To Mr. HERON).—I have not the slightest doubt that the effect of crowding these tenements with families, each of whom is obliged to occupy but one room, while very often it has appeared in evidence that two or three families occupy one room, and that the want of sanitary arrangements in these houses—there being a want of such arrangement in nearly all old houses—everywhere immensely increases the death-rate.

1365. Mr. HERON.—Were those five old houses only built for one family each?—Certainly.

1366. We know from the evidence that the greatest portion of the houses in Rathmines and Penrose townships have been built within the last twenty-five years, and built by Dublin tenementmen?—Yes.

1367. Is there any reason in the world why these townships should not contribute to all the burdens of Dublin?—I cannot see any. I think the only question is the question of poor rate. I must say that, having had some little experience of the Poor Laws, and having taken an active part in opposing the proposition of union rating being connected with the county, and thinking that it is not always right to associate the landed interest with town property, I nevertheless thought, while listening to evidence on the subject in the House of Commons, that I never heard a stronger case in favour of union rating than that which exists in respect of townships like Penrose and Rathmines, which have grown up without a single arrangement by which poverty can be charged on the district, the whole responsibility thereof being thrown on the city.

1368. CHAIRMAN.—Have you become a convert?—No; not to the principle as a matter of general application, but I think it is applicable in particular instances.

1369. Mr. HERON.—Has there been any provision in either Rathmines or Penrose township for artisans' and labourers' dwellings?—I believe not.

1370. Has not property been managed there for the purpose of accommodating a first class proprietary as far as possible?—Yes.

1371. Have you studied the question of tenement houses and their effect on the health of Dublin?—Yes. The dilapidations that have occurred in localities like the Coombe and the Liberties have created a desire

BEGUN,
April 6, 1889.

Mr. J. P.
Byres

BEGUN.
April 9, 1879.
Mr. J. P.
Byron.

on the part of certain persons to supply the want by the creation of tenement houses. There has been a gradual egression of the wealthy classes of the city to the suburbs. Gentlemen first resided in Donegall-street, then in Gardiner's-square, then in Mountjoy-square, then in Fitzwilliam-square, then in Merrion-square, and at last they have gone out into Phibsborough. Doctors and other professional men stopped at Merrion-square, because it did not suit them to be outside the boundaries. I should not wonder if the barristers went out too.

1372. Have you made any calculation as to the increase of these tenement houses in Dublin in consequence of the wealthier classes leaving Dublin?—I have made inquiries on the subject, and I believe that the increase of tenement houses in Dublin within the last eight or ten years must have been between six and seven hundred.

1373. How many were there before that?—I cannot tell.

1374. Has the system of tenement occupation extended to houses which some years ago stood very high both in reputation and valuation?—Unquestionably. I remember when professional men—leading solicitors and others—lived in Gloucester-street and in Grenville-street, but it would be considered far beneath the dignity of such men to live in those streets now. Grenville-street and also Donegall-street have very much gone down.

1375. In your opinion has the value of house property in the city, with the exception of the public and the trade buildings, declined?—That is rather a wide question. I think the value of houses in a wide area of the western portion of Dublin have declined, and I think it has done so because the Government valuation has fallen in proportion to the letting value. Of course, all similar portions of the city of Dublin must have gone down in valuation, and this applies to nearly the whole of the western side of the city. As to the trade buildings, nearly all the trade buildings in Dublin have increased in valuation. I take it that the reductions in valuation that have been made, as set forth in Thom's Directory, have taken place under the law as it bears at present; and that, with respect to the houses, the valuation of which have been increased, the increase has also been made according to the law—that is, the present letting value. In reference to this I only examined a part of Henry-street and a part of Mary-street. It is right to say that I did not make investigation in such a way as to take only houses that suited my purpose. On the contrary, I had no object except to be in the right. I found that the house of Bowley and Draper, which in 1854 was valued at £200, is now valued at £300. Masterson's, the wholesale grocery establishment, which in 1854 was valued at £60, is now valued at £80.

1376. Mr. Corcoran.—Have no alterations been made in those houses?—The increases were owing to improvements. The Apothecaries' Hall, which in 1854 was valued at £130, is now valued at £150, although so very great remodelling has taken place in it. Telford's, which was valued at £50, is now valued at £100. Handerton and Scott's house, which in 1854 was valued at £114, now stands at £400. The valuation of Fawcett's premises has increased from £220, in 1854, to £210 in 1872. Sir John Arnott's, which in 1854 was £720, is now £946. Bell's Bank has increased from £170 in 1854 to £230 at present. Shephard and Company's has increased from £97 in 1854 to £146 this year. Mr. Tidell's has increased from £54 to £90. The total valuation of these ten houses has risen from £1,377 in 1854 to £2,339 in 1872.

1377. Mr. Heron.—Is this system of the wealthy merchants, and traders, and professional classes, leaving Dublin and going to reside in the townships increasing?—Well, I think it is to the full extent of the accommodation given.

1378. Do you consider it an advantage or otherwise that such citizens should live outside Dublin, having nothing to say to the taxation and the management of the city?—It is an enormous disadvantage. I think

that when men of wealth, position, intelligence, and education, simply come to Dublin for the purpose of doing their business, and go out and enjoy country residences, carrying away all the money that they amass in Dublin, and forgoing all the responsibilities that ought to devolve on them, there is an immense disadvantage to the city.

1379. Do you know any other city in which a similar state of things has occurred with respect to townships?—I don't know, but I believe that in a great many in which the circumstances are similar the townships have been included. Every city that I know has an old town and a new. Glasgow has an old part of the town and a new, and so has Liverpool, London, and Edinburgh has the same.

1380. Did you hear Captain Ingram's evidence before the Fire Brigade?—I did.

1381. Are you of opinion that there ought to be only one fire brigade system?—I have long been of that opinion. During the inquiry before the General Purposes Committee we had Captain Ingram before us, and the conclusion we came to was, that that institution was capable of discharging all the duties of the surrounding townships, and that, in fact, it would be an advantage to the city to have it brought into such full operation.

1382. As regards the paving, lighting, and cleansing of the ways and roads of Dublin, are the funds at present at your disposal sufficient for the purpose?—Well, they are scarcely sufficient. I think that the scavenging and macadamizing ought to be done on a more extended scale. I believe that four or five thousand a year more could be advantageously spent if we had it, or even ten thousand.

1383. Are you of opinion that the townships round Dublin should contribute to the maintenance of the roads of Dublin?—Certainly; they largely use them, in fact, they use them to a larger extent than the population of Dublin. Every requirement of the townships of every kind whatever must go out of Dublin. In all the inquiries that the Commissioners have held I don't think they have found a place so hemmed in by surrounding townships, and in which the necessity for being accommodated in every department by the city has been greater than in the case of Dublin. There is not a single article that the townships require, except stone, that they have not to come to Dublin for. They have to get coal, timber, slate, and everything required for household purposes.

1384. And all their groceries?—Yes; the smallest parcels are sent out in vans, while large parcels only must be delivered in Dublin by vans.

1385. Is there an immense number of such vans and light carts for the convenience of the townships?—They drive out to distances. All the hardware and ironware comes out from Dublin to these townships, and all heavy articles of trade.

1386. Is their bread made in Dublin?—I dare say there are some bakers in the townships, but the flour goes out. The raw material goes out for the supply of those places.

1387. CHAIRMAN.—The groceries sent out there, I suppose, must fill their shops?—I think so, Mr. Commissioner.

1388. Mr. Heron.—Have you considered whether the townships should be brought to pay the same uniform rate of taxation with Dublin?—I think the townships would be favourably dealt with if they came over as they are to Dublin. Having regard to the information that I possess with regard to the financial condition of Dublin I think the financial condition of Dublin is in a very prosperous state. We have an estate worth over £750,000, and we have not charged upon it the amount of more than £200,000, that is half a million of money to begin with. I think that is a very large element in favour of the townships coming over. I think that if the charges that are now made on the city generally were properly divided over the townships according to the services rendered under those charges, the city and the townships would be nearly in a position of equalization. But I may say, if I am not

trespassing too much on you, that the question was considered by the committee of the council, and that the conclusion they came to was, that if the principle were affirmed nothing more would be wanted but an equitable arrangement afterwards as to the details.

1380. Mr. Heron.—The municipal rates of 1879 amount to 4s 6d. First as regards the improvement rate, which is 2s. 6d., is there any reason why that rate should not be borne by the townships?—The 2s. 6d., of which 2d. is for domestic sewer rate, and the other 2d for sanitary purposes, has been recently added. Domestic sewers tend to promote public health, as everybody knows; and, therefore, I say that the townships are interested in having such an improvement of the sewers as would lead to an improved state of general health throughout these localities. As to the 2d. for sanitary purposes I am sure there can be no question, not only from Dr. Cameron's evidence, but from my own study of the subject that the sanitary authorities should be free from one centre. Where you have such rates as Dr. Cameron and Dr. Mapother, I think the whole direction of a removable area should be carried out under their supervision. I may also state that I am of opinion that the authority of equal power in neighbouring localities attached to the city are not so effective as a single authority would be under one direction; because in sanitary arrangements your operations should be concurrent but individual. Supposing that one side of a street belonged to the city and that the other belonged to the township, the sanitary arrangements could not be carried out effectively, because the city side might have to wait until the township found it its interest to deal with the other side. I think the sanitary area ought to include the suburban areas whatever they might be.

1380. I believe the main portion of the improvement rate is spent on roads?—Yes.

1381. Is there any reason why the townships should not bear equally these burdens of taxation?—Certainly not.

1382. The next is the sewer rate of 2d. 4—That is the rate that I have referred to as the domestic sewer rate.

1383. Then there is a domestic water rate of 1s. At present one of the townships pays 3½d. and the other 7d., how do you propose to deal with that?—They say that they have vested rights as regards this water rate.

1384. In the first instance, I believe, we have an excess at present of revenue over expenditure for water purposes, and in the next, I believe, that £330,000 of the money borrowed is irrecoverable annuity, and that, although the period may be distant, in thirty years' time I think Dublin will be free from water rate. One of the townships is now paying 7d., and if we took up their mains, or laid mains, there would in their case be no charge for excess of water rate over contract. I believe that last year Rathmines township paid £570 of excess of water rate over contract. That would be 1½d. in the pound on their valuation. If you were to have a uniform rate over the whole proposed area for water it might be about 10d.

1385. Mr. Heron.—Rathmines differs from Pembroke in deriving water from the canal?—It does.

1386. You are aware, of course, that the Vauxhall mains run through that township?—Yes.

1387. And that some persons get water by private contract?—I think it would be most important that the water which has been declared by the best authorities to be the most suited for the use of the public—I mean the Vauxhall water—should be sent to Rathmines independently of the opinion of individuals.

1388. Supposing an amalgamation were effected have you considered what representation the new inclosing districts ought to get?—I think all ought to have a representation according to valuation and population.

1389. Should there be new wards attached to the present fifteen wards in Dublin which are represented

by sixty members?—I think the best course to pursue would be to give independent wards to the outlying districts. It would have a great many advantages, because the members representing the outlying districts would have an opportunity of coming in here and defending the Corporation as regards their district. The best way would be to give independent wards to them if annexed.

1400. Would you propose that the present number of Town Councillors should be increased?—Yes. I think the number would bear to be increased; but I believe according to the present law the quorum is fixed at one third of the existing number, and if that were left as it would operate against the Council, because you might have as large an attendance in the new council; we find that a quorum of twenty is as large a quorum as we ought to have, and that it ought not to be increased by the share of the additional number of members.

1401. Have you considered how many new members ought to be added?—Roughly, taking the valuation in Dublin as about £40,000 for each ward, and assuming the valuation of Pembroke township to be £90,000, I should say that that township would be entitled to have two wards. If Rathmines township had two wards also that would be quite enough. Kilmainham township has a very small area, but districts on the west side of the city could be added to it so as to form a ward. Drumcondra, I think, should form another ward; and Clontarf, if annexed, would be also entitled to be considered a ward. On the question of borrowing money for paving, a great many people have been surprised at the Corporation seeking to borrow a large sum for that purpose. The Council having given the matter their most serious consideration directed a strict account to be kept of the costs of one street, which has recently been newly paved, namely, William-street. That street has been paved according to the new principle. We also inquired into the cost of maintaining that street under the old inclosing system. We found that since the paving has been well done when the sweeping machine went over it once it was swept perfectly clean, whereas no amount of attention would make a street clean while it was inclosed. The cost of maintaining that street in 1877 was £58; while after it had been newly paved the whole cost of maintaining it in 1878 was only £7. Therefore the Corporation came to the conclusion that the saving effected under the new system would far more than pay the interest of the money borrowed.

1402. Has not a portion of Bagget-street adjacent to Pembroke township been recently paved?—Yes, in the best way. All that is being done now is the most improved and expensive way.

1403. Have the footways been laid down with asphalt?—I may tell you that that matter was referred to the committee who had charge of the laying out of the streets, which they would pave under the £100,000 borrowed, and they agreed that special regard should be paid to the thoroughfares leading out of the city. These are all set forth in one of their reports.

1404. You have been working very hard on the committee for some time. Is there anything at the present moment either in the condition of the corporate estates or in that of the revenues of the Corporation to prevent a perfect amalgamation on the most equitable principles of these townships with the city?—Nothing. I believe the whole administration of the Corporation is at present a complete financial success. The most difficult part of the entire management is that relating to the 2s. improvement rate, with which I have had myself something to do. That rate passed in 1851, after serious opposition in the House of Commons; and what it would do in 1851 it is hard to make it do in 1879. At the same time under the administration of Mr. 1. Cameron there is no difficulty whatever with regard to payments. To my knowledge during the last year or two there has been no pretence for saying that there are any financial difficulties what-

DUBLIN,
APRIL 5, 1880.
W. J. P.
Bysshe.

DUBLIN,
April 5, 1873.
Mr. J. P.
Byrne.

even. As to the waterworks, these also are a financial success. With respect to the city estate, there will be a very large surplus in a short period, which will leave the city in a very prosperous condition. I may say that when these matters were inquired into in committee some of the members declared that they were in such a prosperous condition that we ought not to touch the townships with the tongue.

1405. In reference to what is admitted to be covered at present by the improvement rate, would a small additional tax fall on the townships?—Yes.

1406. The Vauxhall Waterworks have been a complete financial success!—Yes.

1407. Do you consider that there ought to be public slaughter or slaughter-houses?—I do. There ought to be three or four in Dublin. They could not do with one if the townships were included. It would be a vast improvement to have an additional number, as the slaughter-houses at present in existence are very poor structures, and very badly managed.

1408. Do you consider that there ought to be any private slaughter-houses at all?—Certainly not. The establishment of public abattoirs should get rid of the whole of them.

1409. Do you think that the townships ought to join in the expense of that?—Certainly.

1410. And also join in the expense of the Fire Brigade?—Unquestionably, in their own interest.

1411. And do you think that, as regards the roads of Dublin, they ought also to join in the expense of maintaining them?—They are largely interested in them, and of course ought to be made liable for their maintenance.

1412. Have you considered the question of public parks and public libraries—supposing that the Corporation had funds enough for improvements in that direction?—Well, I think there would be a great advantage; but the question is one which we cannot touch at present.

1413. You have no money!—No.

1414. Do you consider that the townships should join in the expense of improved Artisans' Dwellings?—Unquestionably. I think Artisans' Dwellings would be of enormous advantage to the whole surrounding districts.

1415. Do you think that the townships ought to join in the expense of a competent public health department?—I think that is one of the most important questions of all. They are quite as much interested in the public health arrangements as the citizens of Dublin.

1416. Do you consider that they ought to join in the payment of all the expenses connected with the public hospitals of Dublin?—Certainly. I believe that at present they bear some share of them, as they are rated in connexion with the County. Nevertheless, unless pressure in that respect falls on the city, in consequence of the number of artificers and labourers using those hospitals and reformatories, that becomes chargeable on the city.

1417. As regards the Cattle Market, has that been a financial success?—Yes. It has paid more than six per cent.; and the Corporation have been considering whether they ought not to borrow money for the purpose of paying off the whole of the original debenture, and borrowing money anew at four per cent. So that if it has paid more than six per cent., it must be a financial success.

1418. Do you see that any advantage would arise from the consolidation of offices—from not having such a large number of persons in employment?—Yes. I am quite sure that if you brought all the officers who discharge township duties outside this hall, they would be more than sufficient to meet the requirements which would be involved by the annexation of the townships.

1419. The report of the Sanitary Commissioners for England and Wales of 1871, contains the following passage:—

"We found that there was a general indisposition on the

part of persons residing in the immediate neighbourhood of boroughs, to their premises being included within the Parliamentary boundary; but that is almost every case this indisposition was attributable to the fear that an extension of Parliamentary boundaries would be followed by a corresponding extension of municipal area, and that consequently they would become liable to the payment of borough rates." "Other extensions of the town beyond the boundary are in many cases so manifest that the question for our decision has been rather what should be the limit of the enlargement than whether an extension of boundary was required," and in the cases in which we have recommended an extension, we have endeavoured to include none but urban populations or adjoining districts, possessing, or likely soon to acquire, a community of interest with the borough."

So that they went beyond the question of what districts were actually built on. I wish also to make quotations from evidence given before the English Sanitary Commissioners, by Sir Henry Thring, Parliamentary Counsel to the Government, and Mr. Tom Taylor, who was Secretary of the Local Government Office from 1858 to 1873. Sir Henry Thring says:—

"I may add, as a correction of my statement respecting Local Authorities, that no system of sanitary legislation can easily be carried into effect, without a real assessment of the boundaries of towns, so as to include populous districts, which have grown up without the actual limits, and although constituting part of the town, neither share in its burdens nor submit to its control."

Mr. Taylor says:—

"That is a point to which my attention has been very much drawn within the last few years. We are constantly getting cases of boroughs under the Local Government Act, in which the population beyond the boundaries of the borough is increasing, while the population within the boundaries is stationary. The population within the boundary has to bear all the rates, while the population outside, which is really and truly a part of the population of the borough, gets all the advantages of the borough expenditure, and bears no part of the borough burdens. At present the only way of exceeding a borough boundary is by going for a private Act of Parliament."

Is there any other matter that you have to suggest?—I think not. I believe that if the city estates were sold in 1881, it would be worth £750,000, against which we have only £350,000, so that the condition of the corporate estate is a financial success.

Cross-examined by Mr. Walker, Q.C.

1420. As I understand it, the principal motive of those who wish the annexation of the townships, is to prevent the wealth and intelligence of the city from going outside it, and not at all any financial motive, as you are well enough as you are?—I don't think it ever entered into our heads to prevent those who represent the wealth and intelligence of the city from going outside of it; but having gone out, I think they should share the responsibilities of the city.

1421. Did I not understand you to say that some of the members said they would not touch the townships with the tongue?—They said that is a financial point of view.—

1422. You don't want them? Now let me be clear about this. Is it your opinion that financially you don't want them?—Financially we don't require them; nor do I think that the Corporation desire to see the townships made a shilling poorer than they are, except so far as regards those improvements which might arise.—

1423. You don't want them financially? Let us proceed by steps. How many members of the Corporation, from your knowledge of the matter, did not desire to have the townships brought in?

Witness.—Did not desire?

Mr. Walker.—Yes.

Witness.—I think the question was carried unanimously at the Council.

1424. Is it by those who did not wish to touch them with the tongue?—Not at all. There were some mem-

bors—not more than one or two—when they came to deal with the financial question, after all that had been said about the Corporation being in debt, were of opinion that it was not the case, and that they were very glad that the matter had been made public.

1425. Some of them did not want the township!—I beg your pardon.

1426. You said that, and I could only write down what you said!—I did.

1427. You said that you ought not to touch them with the tongs!—I said that financially we did not require to do so.

1428. I am satisfied with that. You said that financially you did not require to touch them. The city, then, is sufficient for its wants!—Yes.

1429. Very well. That is a fair and reasonable answer!—Yes.

1430. CHAIRMAN.—But he did not say that the city is to go on paying for them.

Walker.—That is precisely what I mean.

1431. Mr. Walker.—You say that it is a disadvantage that people should go outside the city and not take part in its taxation and its management—that is, I understand there is a sort of patriotic motive on your part that people should take part in the management of the affairs of the city!—I have not studied the patriotism of it, but I have studied the justice of it.

1432. The justice of it; is it as a matter of sentiment or a matter of finance?—As a matter of exercising the authority that they ought to possess, and that wealth and intelligence ought to bring with them in the discharge of the public duties.

1433. That is not a financial reason!—Certainly not.

1434. Will you tell me how many members of the Corporation live outside the city!—How many of them? Unfortunately a great many of them. Even officers who ought to live within the city in order to be able to attend to their duties have gone outside it.

1435. Then the guiding rule that ought to influence public men has been departed from by nearly all the Corporation and all its officers!—Certainly.

1436. You say that not having formed any scale of representation what you would do would be to affirm the principle of annexation, and afterwards make an equitable arrangement!—I beg your pardon, I did not say that I had formed no opinion as to what the representation should be. My answer to Mr. Heron was that we should have representation in proportion to valuation and population, and that a representation based on a valuation of £40,000 would give two wards; but that if three or four wards were necessary that scale should be open to revision.

1437. You said that if the principle should be affirmed you would want nothing but an equitable arrangement!—Certainly not.

1438. Tell me in a few words what you mean by an "equitable arrangement"!—I think it would take me a quarter of an hour to think what it was, and another quarter of an hour to tell you. I think it would be utterly impossible now to settle as important a question which would involve the consultation and consideration of weeks and months.

1439. Certainly; but what I want to know now is your idea of the equitable arrangement that should follow the affirmation of the principle!—Very well. If the principle were affirmed that those townships should be annexed the next question would be what would be a fair and proper representation of them in the Town Council, or whether they should have a representation at all or not; and the next again would be, what is the existing state of taxation in those townships relatively with one another, and what are their future prospects; and you should put one of these considerations against the other, and if there should be a difference on either side it should be properly and amicably settled.

1440. You said you could not give me an opinion about difficulties you could not solve!—Certainly; I am not a fool counsel.

1441. CHAIRMAN.—In Cork what the council said to us was—"We have not considered the question ofwards until we know whether you are inclined to increase the boundaries or not. If you don't propose to increase them we don't want any change. If you do, come down, and we will give you our views about the words."

1442. Mr. Walker.—I am not finding fault with the witness. I only want the facts as to what his views are. You complain, Mr. Byrne, of there being no artisans' dwellings in Rathmines!—I said as a rule those are not. I cannot say that there are none.

1443. Or in Pembroke township!—I say, as a rule, there are not.

1444. As a prudent man, if you were building in Pembroke or Rathmines, would you build artisans' dwellings?—Certainly not; but as an equitable man I would suggest that those townships should bear the charge of them—the charge and responsibility of them where they were built.

1445. CHAIRMAN.—What he says is that there are no artisans in these townships, because the artisans are all in the city of Dublin, while the townships draw all their supplies from the city.

1446. Mr. Walker.—I want to have the fact. As a prudent man, Mr. Byrne, would you build artisans' dwellings in Rathmines or Pembroke townships?—If I owned property there I should be very glad to have artisans' dwellings built in Dublin, and to share the responsibility of them.

1447. Where did the artisans live before these big houses were turned into tenements!—They have been driven into the tenement houses.

1448. I mean before those great mansions were vacated!—I think I told you in very plain terms that there is a very large area in Dublin which is now thoroughly dilapidated, and they live there.

1449. Where did they live before that!—I cannot go back. Have you any date—any century or time?

1450. Well, begin with when people lived in French-street if you like. You know that that was once inhabited by wealthy people!—Or, I do not know that locality. I decline to give you any information on that unless the Commissioners press me.

1451. Or take the Corporation property in Bullock-street!—That is not Corporation property.

Dr. Nareswood.—It does not belong to the Corporation.

Mr. Walker.—What matter if it did.

Walker.—It is a very great matter.

Mr. Heron.—It has been proved that it belonged to a clergyman of the Established Church.

1452. CHAIRMAN.—Of the Dissolved Church.

1453. Mr. Walker (to witness).—Has not it been in the tendency in all cities for small emigrations of the inhabitants to take place from one part to another—for them to go gradually to the more respectable parts?—Certainly—in every city.

1454. And of course the lower classes frequent the deserted houses afterwards!—The lower classes remain in the inferior habitations, and the upper classes go to the better ones.

1455. We know that Chancery-lane was once occupied by the highest people in the city!—Certainly.

1456. And so on from century to century. You have told us that every article of produce that the Rathmines and Pembroke people consume goes out to them from Dublin!—Well, I take it for granted.

1457. Where do they get their hay and straw?—As a rule from Smithfield.

1458. Where do the Dublin people get their hay and straw?—From the market-hire.

1459. Where does it come from to Dublin?—From the country.

1460. Have you ever gone out on Wednesdays or Saturdays and met the carts coming in from the Ashbourne-road?—Yes.

1461. And seen them going out laden with manure?—Yes.

REMARKS.
April 8, 1873.
Mr. J. P.
Byrne.

DUBLIN,
April 5, 1877.
Mr. J. P.
Byrne.

1460. Is not that the heaviest traffic of the city?—Yes.

1461. Have you well studied the number of funerals that go out on the Protestant side to Mount Jerome, and on the Catholic side to Glasnevin?—No, I never studied them.

1462. Are not the numerous funerals that go out of the city into Rathmines township, on the one side, and into the other township on the other, a portion of its heaviest traffic?—The funerals are of no great importance.

1463. Don't they go out into the townships of Rathmines and Drumcondra?—I am sorry to say there is not.

1464. That is not within the boundary of the city of Dublin.

1465. Are not you aware that the tramway companies maintain their own roads?—Certainly.

1466. CHAIRMAN.—You said that you did not want the townships financially. Am I to understand that you mean by that, that according to the state of the municipal rates at present the Corporation are able to pay their way and do their work, but that they do not think it right that they should be doing a large portion of the work of other people without their contributing to it?

MR. BYRNE.—That is precisely our reason. We consider that, financially, we could carry on, but that we labour under a grievance, because part of our financial burdens ought to be borne by those outside.

1467. And that your finances should be eased in that way?—Certainly.

1468. With regard to the fire brigade, you have said that numbers of professional men, who have offices in town, live in the country. I presume that those gentlemen must leave valuable papers and documents in their offices?—No question about that.

1469. They pay no rates for these offices; but I presume the fire brigade must be of great importance to gentlemen of that class?—Of enormous importance.

1470. They derive a benefit in that way without contributing a farthing towards the fire brigade?—Unquestionably.

1471. With respect to artisans' dwellings, I don't understand you to complain that Rathmines or Pembroke have not got artisans' dwellings of their own?—No.

1472. But what you say is, "We in the city are providing artisans' dwellings for artisans who do your work?"—Certainly.

1473. And that you—the townships—should contribute towards that?—Certainly, as far as regards the dwellings themselves, that is the proper construction of my words.

1474. You talked of the artisans at present occupying small and wretched rooms?—Yes.

1475. Have you had any experience on the Sanitary Committee?—No, I am not a member of it.

1476. Do you happen to know the number of individuals that occupy such rooms?—I have seen houses with two families on the one floor, and at least one on each floor, and the wretchedness and filth of those places is enough to make them the seat of disease.

1477. It has been proved before us that there are plenty of places in which people have only between 80 and 20 cubic feet of air in their rooms, whereas a healthy pauper in a workhouse must get 350 feet of air, or something like that!—That is quite the case.

1478. I presume part of your idea is that it would be a great advantage to Rathmines, Ratoath, and Pembroke townships, which use the artisan population of Dublin daily, to have that population in good health, so that they would not be bringing disease with them when they went out to work?—Of course, an enormous advantage.

1479. And that it would be an equal advantage to the people out there—I won't call them citizens—to have the sanitary condition of Dublin as good as possible?—Certainly; that is my idea.

1480. I don't understand you to complain of a man

for changing his habitation and going from Dublin to Cork or anywhere else he likes. But what you complain of is that people who live by Dublin should escape its responsibilities by stepping across an imaginary line, although they use the city every day, while they live in comfortable localities outside it?—It is because of their immediate contact with the city that I complain.

1481. MR. CORROE.—What stage is the artisans' dwellings movement in now?

MR. BYRNE.—I think one area has been taken possession of, and a valuator has made his award; but no actual steps have been taken to enable the artisans' dwellings scheme under the Corporation to be carried to a successful issue.

1482. The Corporation have only cleared the ground?—They have not cleared any portion yet.

1483. They have arranged with the parties?—They have. The area they are clearing out is a dilapidated one in the Coombe.

DR. NORWELL.—A sum of £10,000 has been advanced for the purpose.

MR. CORROE.—With regard to the Fire Brigade, would not that be met by contributions from the townships?

MR. BYRNE.—I think contributions in any case are extremely objectionable. In no way could the services of the Fire Brigade or any other department be made so effectually available as under a representative authority. Supposing that Rathmines or Pembroke gave a contribution of a penny or three halfpence in aid of the expenses of the Fire Brigade, without being represented in the Corporation, they would be always complaining that a preference was given to Dublin, or complaining of something else; whereas if they were represented here the department would be under their orders, the officers would be subject to them, and they would have it in their power to see that the action of the Fire Brigade was all that they required. For these reasons I am against the proposition of a rate in aid.

1484. CHAIRMAN.—I recollect that the following question was asked of Mr. Finn:—Supposing that the townships were annexed to Dublin, and bearing in mind that the bridge tax, which is a tax for the repair of the bridges, is put over the whole Metropolitan Police District, also Clontarf and the proportion of Drumcondra not in the township, would you think it fair that the outlying districts of Blackrock, Monkstown, Kingstown, and Dalkey, and other places contributing to the bridge tax, should also contribute towards the repairing of the city roads and approaches to these bridges?—I think it is a wide question. The township of Kingstown is seven miles from us.

1485. But the legislature makes them pay two pence of bridge tax, and we assume that they do that on the principle that the inhabitants of Kingstown use the bridges, and therefore should pay something towards keeping them up; and they have fixed that the same amount should be paid by the persons living on the top of Dalkey, as by the men living in Sackville-street. If then, they do that with regard to the bridges themselves, is it your idea that the same persons should also be made, by the legislature, to contribute something towards keeping up the roads that lead to those bridges?—It is not, and for this reason; the bridge legislation appears, at all times, to have assumed a different aspect from the road legislation. A Bill was presented by the Corporation to extend the bridge tax to the whole county of Dublin, on the ground that the bridges were used by the large population outside the city, and they stretched the bridge tax beyond what would be equitable in the case of a road tax.

1486. Suppose the townships were to be annexed, as the Corporation propose, is it your opinion that the Council, with its present number of members, could effectively carry on the management and control, not only of the business of Dublin, but also of that of the townships?—The duties of the Corporation are very

which carried on by committees, and I do not think that those duties would be materially altered by any extension of area. The committees make reports upon every transaction. These reports, in the first instance, come in for first reading at meetings of the Council, and for confirmation at the next meeting; and, as a rule, the Council don't sit more than two and a half hours, or any day, for the discharge of their business; so that I think the Council would be quite competent to deal with those enlarged duties. With respect to the committees, there are four of them, namely—Committee No. 1, for paving, cleaning, and lighting, Committee No. 2, for finance and lease business, Committee No. 3, for public health; and Committee No. 4, for general purposes. I think that three of these committees would be perfectly competent for any increase of duty. The duties of the Finance and Lease Committees would not be extended by the annexation. With respect to the duties of the Paving, Cleaning, and Lighting Committees, I must say, from my own knowledge of them, that they are exceedingly heavy; but it would be competent to appoint two branches of that committee, and to divide the duties between them; so that the whole work should be done effectively in that way. All my experience tends to prove that centralisation of management, in such cases, tends to both economy and effectiveness.

1487. Bearing in mind that you have now fifteen wards in the city; what would you propose in the way of representation, if these townships were brought in, and if, at the same time, the number of members of the Council was not to be increased?—I would give them representation.

1488. But supposing that there is to be no increase in the number of members—I understand you to say that sixty members could do the work still?—I think the business could be done by sixty members, but I did not say that I would not increase the numbers.

1489. Mr. Finn told us that in the case of the great

towns of Liverpool and Manchester, which have a much larger population than Dublin, the largest number of members in the Town Council was sixty-four; supposing that you were to have sixty-four members in the Dublin Council, how would you divide them amongst the townships?—I think sixty-four would be quite competent to do all the duties. The great point would be to lessen the quorum.

1490. How would you divide the sixty-four?—You should recast the wards, allotting only two town councillors and one alderman to each ward, instead of three town councillors and one alderman as at present, that would give you fifteen members to be distributed amongst the new wards. I don't see that there would be the slightest difficulty in managing the matter.

1491. There should be some recasting, even supposing that you proceeded on the principle of revaluation, for some of the wards only run up to £29,000, as against a valuation in others of £60,000. I am now speaking from recollection. Do you think it fair that a ward that has a valuation of only £29,000 should get an equal representation as a ward that has £49,000?—Poor law electoral divisions have been made smaller where the population was excessive.

1492. As it is very probable that we will not finish this inquiry before next Tuesday, and that we shall then adjourn for some little time, I would be very glad if you would consider the question of representation in the meantime, and afterwards let me know your views upon it?—I should be very glad to do so.

1493. Mr. Herse (the witness).—You are opposed, as I understand, to any plan of contributions or rates in aid from the townships to the city for any purpose?—I am quite sure it would not work well. I believe that it would lead to differences of opinion and discordant feelings.

The inquiry adjourned until next morning.

DUBLIN.—FOURTH DAY—APRIL 10TH, 1879.

April 10, 1879.

Mr. Charles Dawson.

1494. You are a member of the Town Council of Dublin?—Yes.

1495. You were High Sheriff of Limerick in 1876?—Yes.

1496. Have you ever considered the question of extending the municipal boundaries so as to include the townships?—I have.

1497. What is your opinion respecting it?—My opinion is more particularly formed from that department of the Corporation to which I have given most attention, namely, the public health aspect as I happen to be a member of the Public Health Committee of the Council, and my belief is that the interests of the city and townships being identical, the areas running almost together, that the extension of the boundaries in the matters of public health would be a vast benefit in every way, financially as well as in regard to the promotion of public health.

1498. How financially?—Because I think that limited as are the staffs of the townships for carrying on their sanitation, amalgamation with our municipality would enable the work to be done better for a far lesser sum.

1499. At present are you ever obliged to go outside the city boundaries to disinfect places where there has been infectious disease?—We are, frequently.

1500. How is that managed as regards expense?—We do it to prevent disease extending into our own district, and we have frequently sent out our disinfecting staff on the application of private individuals. They

have not the benefit of having a disinfecting staff in Rathmines or Rathgar, and we have sent them out constantly our staff to disinfect houses, and we have got no remuneration whatever for that—very often not even the mere expense of the person going out on a car, or whatever it is. We have also to disinfect their clothes in our disinfecting chamber for which there is no provision in those townships.

1501. Have you conveyances and carts for that purpose?—Yes, we have conveyances and carts to convey the patients to hospital, and the infected clothes to the disinfecting chamber.

1502. How is that department arranged?—The carts are for the removal of patients in case of infectious disease, and the other conveyances are for the removal of their clothes and bedding for disinfection, and we have given the services of the carts and conveyances to the townships on application many times for the removal of patients and their clothes, the patients to hospital, and the clothes to our disinfecting chamber.

1503. And are those vehicles maintained solely for that purpose?—Solely for that purpose.

1504. I hope they are disinfected every time?—They are.

1505. Have you ever considered the question whether it would be better to burn the clothes?—We have considered it minutely, and we have burned clothes to a large extent, and the only limit to that has been the expenditure it entails, and up to our getting the sanitary rate it was increasing our burdens, and some of the citizens brought us into court for that debt.

DUBLIN.
April 16, 1872.
Ms. Charles
Dawson.

It is the overwhelming opinion of medical men, that the burning of clothes and bedding is the most essential and necessary for the prevention of the spread of disease, and the result of it has been, as a matter of fact, to prevent disease spreading in our own city.

1506. Has Bathmains, or Pembroke, or Kilmainham any of those sanitary appliances?—I speak from the information at my disposal and under correction, and I say they have not. I have made inquiries on the subject.

1507. Is Pembroke providing any of the sanitary appliances of which you speak?—Yes; I believe they are providing a staff for disinfecting purposes, but I did not find in their arrangements any provision for a disinfecting chamber, and the one without the other is not as effective as it might be.

1508. CHAIRMAN.—Did not the Public Health Act of 1866 apply to these townships as well as to other townships?—Yes; but I believe in these instances which I mention they failed to carry out the provisions of the Public Health Act.

Examination resumed.

1509. As regards the spread of disease, is it absolutely necessary to have these sanitary appliances?—Absolutely necessary.

1510. What was the cost of the hot air chamber?—Over £400.

1511. What is the cost of the staff of house disinfectors?—The maintenance of the staff, the keeping of the chamber and all, amounts to £150 per annum.

1512. Is there sanitary inspection of articles of food in Dublin at present?—There is.

1513. Does that come under the duty of your committee?—It does.

1514. How is that managed?—It is managed under the head control of our City Analyst, Dr. Cawcett, and then we have sergeants of police employed, whose duty it is to collect samples and bring them under the notice of the analyst for the purposes of analysis; and in all cases where adulteration is found the necessary steps are taken to prosecute the offenders.

1515. Is there anything of the kind in existence in the townships?—I have made inquiries, and I have not ascertained that there is. There might be a system of inspection, but it is not of the official character that I have stated exists in Dublin; besides you know that the townships must come in for a good deal of the benefit arising from the inspection in the city, because they get their supplies from the city, their fodder for their horses, and their own meat and provisions come from the public markets of the city; and if we have a system in force to prevent adulteration, then those who get their provisions, &c., from the city, but live themselves in the townships, must derive advantage from our arrangements.

1516. As regards diseased meat, is it a fact that great quantities of it are exposed for sale?—It is a fact.

1517. And is it absolutely necessary to exercise supervision in order to prevent it being sold?—It is.

1518. In what quantities is it exposed?—I have not the table of the quantities seized. There is a table to show the amount seized. Mr. Boyle, the secretary to this committee, will have the exact figures to show, and the return of the fines imposed, but from my experience of the Public Health Committee the number of fines and the quantity of meat seized must be very large.

1519. What is done with the diseased meat?—It is destroyed.

1520. How is it destroyed?—I don't know how they destroy it. Mr. Boyle will tell you what the procedure is after the meat is taken, but it is not allowed to be sold for consumption.

1521. As regards the system of house drainage, does that come under the notice of your committee?—Yes.

1522. Have you any suggestion to make to the Commissioners on that subject?—I have a suggestion to

make with regard to any effective system. There are only two effective systems—one is by water carriage and the other by domestic sewage. The water carriage system to be perfect should have main sewers in proper condition and with proper levels. There should also be perfect communication between the dwellings and the main sewers, by means of drains properly ventilated; it should also have a perfect tank and pressure of water. Without these three conditions drainage is rather an evil than a benefit. In Dublin we have not now power, but we will have power to insist that these three conditions shall exist. The main sewer does, as a matter of fact, exist, but when plans were made of the Dublin sewer we found in the most respectable localities—Fitzwilliam-square and Fitzwilliam-place, and such districts—that the reason of the bad condition of the sewage was not that the main sewer was defective, but that the connecting drains which the householders ought to look after, and which were not amenable to corporate inspection until this new Act passed, were in a bad state. They were broken, and the sewage, instead of going into the proper channel, was permeating under the houses. The Corporation has now power to order a sanitary inspection and to make these drains perfect, and we have ample water pressure, whereas, I think, in Bathmains they can't have from the Canal water sources ample flushing for their sewers, no matter how perfect they may be.

1523. At present where does the sewage of Bathmains go? Does any of it come into the city?—I am more acquainted with what they intend to do than what they have done up to this. There is a joint scheme of the townships of Pembroke and Bathmains going on which no doubt will be a great improvement on the existing state of things; but it will never in Bathmains, at least, have that water flushing without which the most perfect system of sewage is an evil rather than a benefit. They have not a sufficient pressure to send water to the water closets. The joint scheme under the one municipality proposed would have been a better scheme, no matter how good the one in Bathmains and Pembroke. It would have saved the taking the drainage through what I think is a flat part of Pembroke. They would have joined us at a portion which would not have gone through that, and I think the effect would have been better. The drainage, as proposed by these townships, is an improvement, but the joint scheme was better.

1524. Is the main sewer running down by Fitzwilliam-street and Merrion-square flushed with water at present?—Perfectly. On examination it was found as fresh as the water in a river could be—a free, fresh current of water going one way and one of air the other. I may mention before we leave Bathmains that the sewage disposal they project has this difficulty, which I mention with hesitation, not being an engineer. In the projected scheme of sewage, the sewage would have been carried out so far that it was proved by experiment it could not have come back, but the outfall for this new scheme of sewage will inevitably throw it on the opposite shores of Clontarf, it will silt the harbours, and inevitably throw the sewage on the shores of Clontarf and along that side, whereas the amalgamated scheme, as shown by many experiments, would have taken the sewage out so far that it was beyond the possibility of returning.

1525. Mr. COYKON.—That Bathmains drainage is an accomplished fact?—Yes.

1526. Mr. HOWE.—It is not running yet?—It is not complete yet; but I fear now that even with amalgamation both schemes must go on.

1527. CHAIRMAN.—If Bathmains and Pembroke are brought in, you would not propose to end all that?—Certainly not; but I think it is desirable to show that all the operations of the Corporation, either now or in the future, have been of that character which would have been beneficial both to the city and the townships.

DUBLIN.
April 16, 1878.Mr. Charles
Davison

1538. Mr. Heron.—In reference to the expenditure in Rathmines at present, I am informed it is only £6, for all purposes!—Yes.

1539. Is that much less than in towns of a similar size all over Ireland?—I have looked to some of about the same population, and I find the expenditure is considerably greater. I think £7,000 in 1866 and £9,000 in 1877 is a very limited expenditure for a township of the dimensions and population of Rathmines—in fact it is too low to do the things; and as you saw by previous evidence the amount spent on sanitary and sewage matters was quite inadequate to the demand of such a place.

1540. CHAIRMAN.—What other towns do you refer to?—I refer to a return I saw of Llandaffshire, for instance. The population of Derry is 30,000 odd, and the valuation £65,000; and its expenditure is about £17,000 a year, as compared with Rathmines at £9,000.

1541. Mr. Heron, q.c.—In Rathmines for the half-year ending the 25th March, 1878, the entire expenditure for sanitary purposes was £287; that included 60 guineas fee to the engineer and £108 for interest?—Yes.

1542. I don't know whether your attention was directed to the expenses of Rathmines in 1878!—The only real expenditure for sanitary purposes in March, 1878, was £17 10s. for salaries, and £45 for sewage.

Mr. CORRONS.—Yes; we have all that in evidence already.

1543. Mr. Heron, q.c.—As regards the advantages of combined management, have you made any estimate of the saving to the city and the townships in the expenses of the staff?—We have in this way. I think if the areas were amalgamated that the number of committees would not necessarily be increased. We have in the Corporation three standing committees. We have the No 1 Committee, the chairman of which has been examined already, which provides over the paving, lighting, and cleansing of the city; No. 2, the Markets Committee; No. 3, the Finance and Loan Committee; and the Public Health Committee, which is a new one. Taking the whole of these four committees, I think the only increase they would require would be a clerk or two additional to the Paving, Lighting, and Cleansing Committee, and perhaps a clerk or two to the Public Health Committee. The other committees would not require assistance, inasmuch as they have to deal with the city estate, in which no change would occur. Therefore, I think an expenditure of, say at the very utmost, including any necessary additional staff, of about £500, would be sufficient; and we had formed a calculation, on the basis of other places, of what the expenses of these townships would be, and what would be the saving effected, and I thought it would be £1,200 or £1,300; but now, when I have seen their accounts, and see that the compensation, or pension and salaries, is over £800 in one township, I say the saving would be much greater; but at all events, we would have a saving of £1,200 or £1,300 a year on the amalgamated staff.

1544. CHAIRMAN.—But surely you could not expect your engineer now, for instance, to do all this increased work, without some increase of salary and assistance besides!—I would. The reason I made this remark is that the engineering department is now in a somewhat different position from what it was. We have now a deputy surveyor in the city, and his department has relieved the engineer of all, I may say, exactly the executive work of the city, as regards paving and the road-making and other things, and I think now that the Vartry waterworks are an accomplished fact, and many other great undertakings are finished, that we would not require another engineer. We might require another good clerk at £100 a year, or another assistant. We have also an assistant engineer, and we would not require anything like the three engineers of the townships. They have their engineers at present, and all the staff of the engineers;

and certainly we would not want them in addition to our own, so that on the whole there would be a saving in the amalgamated administration.

1545. Mr. Heron, q.c.—Have you considered the advantages the townships derive from the Cattle Market, and whether they should contribute anything towards the city for that?—Yes. These advantages, I think, have been very fully put before you by the chairman, and as regards the additional scavenging weight they put upon the city. We have endeavoured to show they also derive something from our staff of inspectors, for we not only inspect live cattle, but also the fodder; so that if there is a disastrous or fraudulently made up load of hay it is examined as much for the townships as for the city, and they derive benefit from the examination by our staff and the caution used to prevent fraud or anything of that kind.

1546. What is the present expenditure for sanitary matters in the Corporation?—The present expenditure for sanitary matters is about £16,000 a year, of which £5,000 is for sanitary improvements, and about £10,000 for sewage.

1547. That is £15,050 for the year!—Yes, per annum.

1548. That contrasts largely with the expenditure in the townships!—Yes; in proportion to valuation it is as two to five, and to population it is as one to two, as compared with our expenditure.

1549. In considering the question, have you taken into account the objection which we know the townships have to the amalgamation?—I have these that have come under my observation.

1550. I believe one is—they say the Corporation of Dublin do not manage their own affairs well at all!—I think, whatever ideas prevailed before on that score, this inquiry will be very sure to disintegrate them. It is a demonstrable fact that the city received, when it took over the management of the civic affairs from the old Corporation, a debt of £340,000. Yet that debt has been reduced by nearly £100,000. Its whole debt is now £260,000, leaving £200,000 as the debt contracted by the Corporation, and that £60,000 is represented by two of the greatest works ever achieved by any municipality. The success and the efficiency and the economy with which the Vartry waterworks were constructed compare with any works in the world. These works represent £300,000, and the remainder of the debt is represented by the Cattle Market—undertaking which has proved a great benefit to every one—and a financial success. Above all this such are the conditions of the undertaking as to the Vartry works that not only will it be, after a time, free of expense, but a paying concern, leaving a large margin of profit, so that I think the Corporation, as far from showing it has contracted any debts by jobbery or mismanagement, has contracted honest debts, for which it shows enormous advantages. It has alienated no property, and that cannot be said of the old Corporation, for if every one had their own, Rathmines would have to contribute £50,000 a year, as it was once corporate property. It is from that township Dublin is supplied with its severest critics, yet they have got our property there, and we have not disposed of any corporate property since it came into our possession.

1551. As regards the debts of the great towns of England, have you considered that?—I have; and I have taken them under three heads—the towns that have borrowed to the extent of three times their valuation; the towns that owe twice the amount of their valuation; and those that owe one and a half their valuation; and I have looked into some of them where things are well done, such as Bradford and Leeds, and I find the debts are there three times the valuation. Bradford, with a valuation of £600,000, has borrowed over two millions of money, and has got powers to borrow £500,000 more. In the same way with Leeds and the other great English towns. In fact, wherever progress has been made, it has been made by the borrowing of millions of money. Here we have only borrowed to the extent of our valuation, which includes the old debt, now reducing by us. I may say, also, that in

DUBLIN
April 19, 1857.
Mr. Charles
Dawson.

London for great works of public advantage, such as the Thames Embankment, the approaches to the bridges, and all that kind of work, not only have they a large fund, but an indirect rate from coal and wine. Those rates yield an income of £250,000. Money raised on that rate has been expended on the Thames Embankment works, and the making of new streets, like Cannon street, and works such as we are asked here to make out of our limited resources.

1542. Have the sanitary arrangements made by your committee been successful in preventing the spread of disease?—They have been very successful. With the exception of this year, the abnormal death rate of which is due entirely to the excessively severe winter, and the prevalence of epidemic disease—which has also affected other places—for instance, Galway and Sligo, which have none of those bad sanitary arrangements which Dublin possesses, the death rate is higher than in Dublin—with the exception, therefore, I say, of this year, the death rate has been kept down, and it has only been augmented by those diseases to which I have referred—smallpox, &c., which are ascribed by some to the Corporation. But the fact is as stated by the Medical Association of Ireland—the spread of smallpox is mainly due to the failure on the part of the Government to administer, after repeated demands, the Vaccination Laws of Ireland to those existing in England. The Government has failed to do so; and that, as the Medical Association states, has been the prolific cause of the spread of smallpox; by our exertions we have not only kept the disease within small bounds as to prevent the duty being transferred to the urban, as it would have been by the Local Government Board had there been any necessity, but to bring from the Local Government Board in an uncollected manner a testimony as to the successful way we have combated the disease.

1543. I believe the Local Government Board had frequent communication with you on the matter during the past year?—Yes.

1544. We know there has unfortunately been a very heavy mortality in Dublin during the past year. Did you hear the evidence of Mr. Byrne and Mr. Parnell in reference to these old houses in which unfortunately our artisans have to live, and the effect that state of things has?—Yes; that has been a particular study of mine, for I read a paper at the Royal Dublin Society on the artisans' dwellings in Dublin, which originated the formation of an artisans' dwellings company. I believe the most prolific cause of the high mortality in Dublin is the want of proper house accommodation for the working classes, which entails the necessity of their sleeping in such numbers as to give only sometimes 150 cubic feet per person of air space, whereas the minimum allowed by law is 300 cubic feet per person. We have constantly to serve notes for over-crowding, and therefore I think the disengaged condition of the houses of these people, the want of windows, the absence of proper repairs to the roof, and so on, are the real causes of the high death rate. We have asked the Registrar-General for a return of the death rate, dividing the list so as to show the nature of the company of those who died, and although he has declined to publish such a list, he has kindly submitted it to me for the last three or four weeks, and we find the proportion of the wealthy and better classes forming part of the death rate is disproportionately small, and there need be no scare amongst the upper classes, for the mortality amongst them in relation to the others is wonderfully small, and in the deaths from syphilitic diseases,

1545. As regards the return, was it specially with reference to these roomkeepers and persons living in tenement houses?—No; we got the whole. In other countries there is provision that not only should the home where disease of an infectious character has occurred be known, but a cordon should be drawn about it. In the Hague, for instance, the houses are tabulated, and people forewarned. In Dublin we

have no means of finding out these places, but when you have the corporation of the person situated, and you find he is a tradesman, you could naturally deduce from that that he doesn't live in Merrion-square.

1546. CHAIRMAN.—In what way do you say that that affects all the townships?—It affects them in the way I tell you—that population is of the labouring and artisan class. For instance, if a painter gets a contract to paint in Rathmines, he sends men out from the city to Rathmines. We keep that population here, and they are pressed for room in the city, and require sanitary improvements which cannot be had without great vigour of management and expense, and all the odium of the high rate falls on the city, while in reality these people are working for the residents of Rathmines. In fact, it is just the state of things which led to the unanimous expression of opinion on the part of the Select Committee appointed to report on the subject of Metropolitan Local Government—that in London there is great injustice done by the wealthy classes living away where taxation is light, and leaving the burden to be borne by those in less wealthy districts, and the committee say that that is a grievance, that ought to be remedied by uniform rating. All these reports show that that has almost been the universal recommendation, and this particular committee refer to the injustice of such a district as St. George's, Hanover-square, being rated on a 2s. 2d. scale, while a poor place like Whitechapel is rated at 8s. 6d., and they say that is a very unfair state of things, and that is just what we are endeavouring to redress in Dublin.

1547. What is the date of this report to which you refer?—May, 1857; the Select Committee's Report on Metropolitan Local Government.

1548. Now, with reference to the municipal rates, they amount this year to 4s. 6d.—Yes.

1549. And the principal one is the improvement rate of 2s. 4d.—Yes.

1550. As regards the townships according to that table which you have prepared, if the rates were all thrown together, the total rate to be levied would be 3s. 11d.; the relief to the city would be £16,000 a year, and that would be thrown on the four townships, but Rathmines is the only one apparently that would suffer much by that in the way of increased taxation?—Yes.

1551. As regards the 2s. 4d. improvement rate do you consider the townships ought to bear their share of that?—I think they ought.

1552. They say, however, that for some time houses have been built and contracts have been made between builders and employees, and between the landlord and the tenant, on the faith of low taxation continuing under Acts of Parliament?—No doubt there will be that temporary infliction of additional taxation, but the grievance, whatever it is, falls into insignificance in comparison with the advantage which at no very distant period these houses in these townships will gain. Houses are not property that will become worthless in a few years, they will not have faded away in thirty years, and although there will be some little pressure on the occupiers at present there will be immense gain ultimately, and that at a period not so distant as some people are in the habit of suggesting.

1553. Have you ever considered the suggestion made by some as to this amalgamation that for some time the increased taxation should not be put on the districts brought in?—There are cases in the annexations that have taken place in England where in such case as you mention—where there are great hardships owing to the tenants and the landlords having entered into contracts as to the payment of rates—they have been allowed for a period to pay only half of the new rates.

1554. Mr. COTTON.—What case do you allude to?—I don't know the exact town, it was either Bolton or

part of those stated by the Town Clerk as being annexed outlying townships. They were let in, paying half the new rate for certain items or half the rate on which they periodically suffered.

1555. Mr. Heron.—As regards Pembroke and Killiney you will see their interests is almost nothing!—It will be very slight indeed, Pembroke will only be paying 8d more, and Killiney 5d.

1556. That is, supposing they were all annexed, the very worst position they would be in!—Yes, and that is to be qualified by the wiping out of many of these rates in the future.

1557. And as one of the advantages Rathmines would get a full supply of Vartry water!—Yes.

1558. Has that subject come before your committee still?—Yes, at present the Vartry pipe passes through Rathmines.

1559. And there are consumers of the Vartry in the township. Some persons are supplied by private contract?—Yes.

1560. Would the mains laid down by the Rathmines Commissioners be available for the Vartry supply?—I presume they would, but on that point I am not very clearly informed; but, I think, having the mains laid there for the Vartry it would be a very easy matter to supply the townships. The only advantage put forward here on inquiry as to the superiority of the water they have in Rathmines was put forward by the chairman (Mr. Stokes) that it was good for washing, and the only question is whether it is better to have it good for washing or good for life.

1561. Mr. Corcoran.—Which water is said to be the softer?—Rathmines for washing purposes. I am not in a position to say whether Mr. Stokes said it was better for washing than the Vartry, but that was the only advantage put forward.

1562. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—You are reversing Mr. Stokes' evidence, and reversing the facts!—No, his evidence was that it was good for washing, better than the Vartry.

1563. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—You are altogether wrong as a matter of fact. This is a matter of mere memory, and it is not worth a penny!—No, because the testimonies in favour of the Vartry are so overwhelming from a scientific point of view I need not supplement them.

1564. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—In reference to the present position of the Town Council did you make an analysis of the position, &c., of the members?—I have so frequently heard a good deal about the social status of the Corporation not being what it should be that I looked into the matter carefully, and I find in the Corporation at present four gentlemen who got the honour of knighthood from the Queen or Lord Lieutenant for their social position, and the manner in which they discharged the high duties of their office as Lord Mayor. We had in the Corporation a little time ago two members who were sheriffs of two counties, Longford and Roscommon, seventeen gentlemen in the commission of the peace, and ex-members of grand juries, we have one of the members of Parliament for the city, and the junior member for Tipperary; we have in addition to Dr. Moyen, who was recently elected, seven gentlemen of learned professions, and we have got five or six gentlemen who have university degrees. We have got certainly, I think, about twenty gentlemen who could be called not only merchants but leading merchants such as Mr. Dockrell, Alderman Campbell, Sir James Mackey, and so on, so that I don't think our body can be charged with want of status.

1565. And you have two high sheriffs of counties?—Yes.

Cross-examined by Mr. Anderson, Q.C.

1566. You look at the proposed annexation from the Public Health aspect?—Yes.

1567. To which you have devoted considerable time?—Yes.

1568. Where is the hot air chamber?—It is at a place called Marrowbone-lane.

1569. Would you regard it as more desirable, if Rathmines and Phibsborough were annexed, to have a hot air chamber out there in these townships, or to compel them to bring in their clothes, or whatever they wanted disinfected, into the city?—If a proper place could be found, if areas were added according to the population and its demand, there might be a hot air chamber in the new district.

1570. Would you prefer it, viewing the matter from a sanitary aspect?—As a sanitary necessity I would; but the difficulty we found in the Corporation was to get a space for anything of that kind. In Limerick they proposed to have a hot air chamber, and the same difficulty arose.

1571. Probably the sanitary authority of Rathmines might find a place for one in Rathmines if they wanted it?—Yes.

1572. It consists of a cast-iron chamber, with a furnace in it?—Yes.

1573. And I suppose the township could manage to put that up for itself if they set themselves about it?—But my point is that they have not done so; while, if they were in the city, they would have the advantage of the one that exists; and if under the amalgamation a scandal was found necessary, they would have it supplied for them.

1574. For what period has these necessary appliances been in existence in Dublin?—I speak under the correction of Mr. Boyle, who will come after me, and who knows all these details. Since 1868 they have been in existence—in fact, as soon as we got power to obtain them. If you will allow me to say that within six months after we got the power to erect this chamber it was erected.

1575. But before 1868 Dublin was deprived of that important appliance which you consider so necessary?—It was. Before you pass away from that, perhaps I might say that if you compare the invasions of small-pox, since the foundation of this appliance, with the period before this chamber came into existence, you will find the comparison in favour of the chamber.

1576. CHAIRMAN.—But against that, it might be said that the erection of such a chamber in the city would have been considered a nuisance before the Public Health Act, which legalizes it, and that Act was only passed in 1866.

1577. Mr. Anderson, Q.C.—The Public Health Act extends to the townships as well as to the city of Dublin?—That is what I wanted to show—that the townships have the power, but that they have not exercised it, and that we exercised it six months after we got it.

1578. CHAIRMAN.—I understand you to say that under the Public Health these chambers, &c., are compulsory?—I don't know whether they are obligatory or not.

1579. Mr. Anderson, Q.C.—And if they are compulsory they will be had now before I come to the drainage question. You say you look upon the system of inspection of food in the city as an argument in favour of the annexation of the townships?—I do.

1580. Are you aware that, as regards Pembroke, it is practically self-supplying in matters of food?—I am aware of that.

1581. You know they have six slaughter-houses, which are properly regulated, and from which they supply meat to their own shops?—But they get their live stock in Dublin.

1582. These slaughter-houses are under inspection?—I think there is inspection, but then their stock comes from us, and they have the advantages of our inspection.

1583. Is that what you refer to when you speak of the inspection of food?—No. No one will question the fact that the residents in Pembroke must necessarily buy, and do buy, great quantities of goods of all kinds in the city. There is inspection of every article of food by

DEBATE,
APRIL 12, 1871.

Mr. Charles
DUNION.

BRENT
April 16, 1879.
Mr. Charles
Dawson.

over staff. There is not a single article that is not amenable to the inspection of our staff, and, of course, any persons living in the townships, and buying their goods in the city have the advantage of that system of inspection.

1584. But you don't inspect out at Pembroke and Rathmines, where they supply their own meat—We don't inspect the dead meat, but a great many don't deal exclusively with the shops in the townships although living there. I, myself, although living in Dalkey, frequently have to deal with the butchers in town. I think a great many of the residents of the townships do also.

1585. If there were six slaughter-houses and twenty butchers' shops in the township, the argument is, that they can't trust them!—The argument would be that it would be a most unnecessary matter to have them without inspection; and I say a great deal of the necessity for inspection is abolished by the system of inspection which we pursue in the city.

1586. Are you acquainted with the arrangements of the slaughter-houses in Pembroke?—No.

1587. Have you inspected them?—No, but I did inspect the model one which is supposed to be the model for the whole of the Dublin area, and that model, which is allowed to be managed in the best manner, is infinitely below what it ought to be. If that is so with the model one, I presume the others are still more below the mark.

1588. How many of the superior class slaughter-houses have been established?—Very few.

1589. Now, about the drainage. In 1870 Dublin was very much impressed with the necessity of improved drainage and the purifying of the Liffey, and they obtained powers to borrow £300,000 for the purpose!—Yes.

1590. And I believe in the very next year Parliament intimated that these works should be speedily proceeded with?—Yes.

1591. And these works, whatever they were, did not include or make any provision for a large portion of the Pembroke district—namely, on the east and south-east of the Dodder—the low-lying district!—If I am wrong, information on that point will be given by the officers belonging to the department. From what I have gathered in my short experience of the Corporation, which I state merely on my own personal responsibility, and it can be corrected by those who know the date, that scheme did embrace a thorough drainage system for the townships, and I was not aware it left out anything important.

1592. I have the sanction of Parliament for saying that there was no provision in the Act of 1871 for the drainage of that portion of the Pembroke township situated on the east and south-east of the river Dodder, which was wholly excluded from the operation of that Act!—Previously I was not aware of that, but I am perfectly sure that on that point our engineer, and those who had the conduct of that measure, will be able to give some reasonable answer.

1593. In 1873 that was the state of things, and up to 1875 nothing was done, and in 1875 the powers to borrow £300,000 were increased to £500,000. To what extent was any expenditure made under these powers which these Acts conferred?—I believe very little preliminary expenses, but the reasons for the halting of that scheme I do not purpose giving you because they will be adequately given by others.

1594. As a matter of fact, things went on in that way until 1877, and of course you are aware that then Parliament was applied to by the Rathmines and Pembroke townships to get what the Corporation had not hitherto supplied them with—a system of drainage!—Yes.

1595. And the Corporation opposed that Bill?—Yes.

1596. And Parliament thought fit to grant the powers sought.

1597. And under that Act I believe you are aware that very large expenditure has been incurred, and further expenditure is about to be incurred!—I am aware of that.

1598. And you would not propose to disturb that state of things—I think it would be impossible owing to the state of things now to do so, but I think the effect of the outfall of that system, as it appears to me professionally acquainted with it, will be injurious; for instead of going out to sea, as the main drainage proposed to do, it leaves the sewage where it must return, and it will be thrown on the shores of Clontarf; I believe that will be the case.

1599. Do you speak from engineering experience or is it a general opinion by a gentleman who doesn't profess to have engineering skill?—From what I have read, and from what I have heard on the subject from competent persons.

1600. If any of the engineers that have been examined in Parliament gave a directly contrary opinion, you would not give your opinion against theirs?—I would appeal to the engineers of this Corporation, who have given opposite opinions, and put the one against the other.

1601. I am happy to learn from you that the composition of the present Corporation of Dublin is such that it contains members of Parliament, titled gentlemen, members of the learned professions, and wealthy merchants, and people of that kind. That gives it a dignified and desirable position!—Quite so.

1602. And I suppose, having regard to these circumstances, you look upon it as very well off in that respect!—I look upon it as fairly with other bodies, or even with the townships of which you speak.

1603. And you would not regard the acquisition of some gentlemen from the townships as necessary to remove an existing defect in the existing body!—I would regard it as most essential in this respect—that instead of being kickers upon the ditch they would come and work themselves in the Corporation. Some one talked of our financial position, but it is not because we are financially strong we are to allow them to get advantages for which they don't pay anything. Then as regards their annexation, instead of being critics in matters which they don't understand, they would go into the Corporation and bring there their knowledge of these townships and their knowledge in managing these affairs, and a great deal of information, and they would be fair co-partners in an arduous task instead of being irresponsible critics as they now are.

1604. Is one of the objects then to discern criticism?—Yes, to discern the criticism which arises through want of information. This very morning I found gentlemen still unaware we were not receiving the whole £6d. or 8s. 6d. for rates, but when they come to administer those rates they will see how they stand. Now it has been frequently alleged, and it is a great necessity that it should be dispelled, that the mortality of Dublin is abnormally great, and that Rathmines and Pembroke compare with it most favourably. That is a very erroneous idea. The health of Dublin as regards syphilis and preventable diseases is better, and getting better, with the exception of the one disease of small-pox, to which I have referred. I have returns here of the death rates in 1877, 1878, and what has passed of 1879, and I find that by these returns of the Registrar-General that for fifteen weeks in the year 1877, and for twelve weeks in the year 1878, and for six or seven weeks of 1879 the death rate of Rathmines has been considerably over the death rate of the city. With a population entirely exempt from that class which I have shown tends most to increase the death rate of the city, the poor, ill-housed, badly clothed, and badly fed, the death rate is higher, and therefore it is incontestable that the death rate of Rathmines, instead of being peculiarly good in comparison with the city, frequently and for the number of weeks I have mentioned, not only comes up to, but exceeds, the death rate of the city.

1605. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean that even including the deaths in the workhouses and hospitals in the city?—I take the whole death-rate of the city. I will give you data. On January 27th, 1877, the

death-rate of the city was 28·6. The whole death-rate was 29·4, including every person from every public institution, no matter where they came from; and the death-rate of Rathmines on the same date was 29·2, that is equal, or very nearly so. Then on the 3rd March, 1877, the death-rate in the city was 31·6 per thousand, and in Rathmines it was 34·1 per thousand. On the 10th March the death-rate in the city was 34 per thousand; in Rathmines it was 31 per thousand—that was nearly equal. On the 7th April, 1877, the death-rate of Dublin was 31·6 per thousand, and in Rathmines 33·5 per thousand. These facts show that Rathmines has a sanitary difficulty to contend with. I have also here a table where the deaths from symptomatic diseases are given—that is the diseases which are preventable, and are due largely to the sanitary arrangements. In Rathmines, for the week ending 10th March, 1877, the symptomatic death-rate is 3·9 per thousand; the symptomatic death-rate in the south city, given in the same return, is 1·6 per thousand; South City, No. 2, is 3·2, and South City, No. 3, is 3·7 per thousand.

1606. Mr. Walker, q.c.—You have taken isolated weeks?—I admit I have taken fifteen in one year and twelve in another.

1607. Take say quarter you choose in which these weeks are included, and give us the return?—I have not got the quarterly returns. I did not mean to make an unfair statement. I meant to say that for fifteen weeks of one year, twelve of another, and five or six weeks of the present year, the death-rate in Rathmines is higher.

1608. These are not simply consecutive weeks?—They are nearly consecutive weeks. I have the returns here, and I find on March 15th, this year, the death-rate of Dublin is 38 per thousand, and of Rathmines 43·8 per thousand. Pembroke this week is 43; the death-rate in the city on March 8th was 36 per thousand, and in Rathmines 34 per thousand. What I mean to convey is, that I don't deny there are a great number of weeks, and the majority where the death-rate of Rathmines compares favourably. Yet, that notwithstanding its exceptional advantages, there are a large number of weeks, amounting to several months in the year, when the death-rate of Rathmines is beyond Dublin to a very large extent. What I want to show is that even in Rathmines they have sanitary defects to contend with. There is an association in existence which has showered a hundred darts against the Corporation, but they have not extended their attention to the small expenses of those townships for sanitary matters.

1609. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any hospital or place for the reception of sick in Rathmines provided by the authorities there?—I am not aware.

1610. Therefore, it is impossible for them in Rathmines to comply with the Public Health Act of 1846?—It is. That would be a very serious matter if they had anything of a very large artisan population.

1611. Very serious, because you are aware that under the 26th section of the Act there is an order of the justices to remove any sick person?—Yes.

1612. Then, in point of fact, so far as these townships are concerned, if there is a sick person lying in one of these townships without proper accommodation, there is no power whatever to have that person removed?—There is power, but they have no application.

1613. No, they have no power, because they have no hospital, and if they had a place they have power.

Mr. Walker, q.c.—Yes, sir, they have a place. The Meath Hospital is the County Dublin Infirmary, and Pembroke has two or three hospitals.

Mr. Heron, q.c.—To which we contribute.

Mr. Walker, q.c.—Voluntarily, and only if you like.

1614. CHAIRMAN.—Have you considered, supposing the townships are brought in, on what terms they

should be brought in—are they to be brought in paying equally all rates with the citizens, and getting equal privileges; that is, I mean equal privileges sharing in the corporate property and its increase from time, which would have the effect of reducing the rates, sharing the benefit, of course, of the improvement rate, which will be paid off from time to time by the sinking fund of £5,500 a year, and also benefiting by the annual sinking fund of £19,000 a year for the waterworks. Ought they, in your opinion, to get the benefit of all these matters the same as the citizens of Dublin, and pay equal rates for them, or have you formed any idea of the terms on which they are to be brought in—I think if they are brought in for the purpose of sanitation and better management alone, they would then be subject to a large increased taxation, and we might enter into the consideration of how that burden would be lessened, but when we consider that we give them the benefits we have referred to as very soon realisable, we treat them very well in allowing them in on the same terms, and I think we would be treating them very well in equalising the rate.

1615. Would you suggest there should be differential rating?—I think the circumstances of this case are so peculiar, that if there was any increase in the rating they should pay the furthest for getting the enormous advantages in which they had not previously participated.

1616. In the townships, as at present, there are certain classes of property that pay only a small, or a certain proportion of the rate. In some of the townships, I believe, the railways only pay one-fourth. In Pembroke, I believe, it is five-sixths. Now, in your opinion, suppose the townships were included, should railways and market gardens, and arable lands, be brought in on a lower scale, or would you say they should be brought in on an equal scale, paying on their valuation equally, or on a differential scale, and if so, what differential rate would you suggest. Have you considered that?—I have not considered that, but that matter suggests to me to remember what I have read, that some distinction should be made between railway and other kinds of property. I think we must have some railways within our own boundaries at present, and on whatever basis they are now rated should be the basis in the enlarged area.

1617. Isn't it a well known fact that the valuation put on railways running through townships is much higher than the actual value of the land itself if valued as land, and therefore, if a railway is to pay one-fourth on its valuation, practically, it would make them pay the full rate on account of their value being so much higher than the land adjoining, which pays only one-fourth on its valuation?—I think you are quite right, for I think in the townships where there is land worth £20 an acre, it only goes into the general valuation of the country at £3 an acre, and if the railways are treated on equal terms it would be just making some such distinction as you mention.

1618. And the distinction is kept up in the Sanitary Act of last year?—Yes. The anomalies of taxation in the city are of the most startling character. The disproportion between the valuations and the rentals in the city is something extraordinary. I will just refer you to two houses to show what I mean. The former, 28, Upper Backhill-street, is valued at £150, and it pays a rental of £818; and there is a house in Rutland-street valued at £75 a year where the rental is £287. In the townships you have land valued £3, and sitting at from £15 to £20 an acre. So that I think in any amalgamation the whole system of valuation in the townships and the city should be rectified.

1619. Mr. Cotton.—You think there should be a re-valuation for the city and the townships?—Certainly. There are glaring instances where the valuations are enormously different.

1620. CHAIRMAN.—I want to know your view with regard to the rating of lands. If Pembroke was

DUBLIN.
April 20, 1878.
Mr. Charles Dawson.

Dublin,
April 10, 1881.
Mr. Charles
Dawson.

brought in, so that the land of the Wicklow Railway be brought in, and the same way with Kilmainham and other townships, there must be a considerable portion of railways valued in them, and the valuation of the portions of railways running through these townships is much higher than the valuation of the same distance of railway running through a country district. That being so, the difference is created on account of the great traffic the railways get from the town. What is your view as to the differential rating of railways and canals?—My view is just something of the nature you have sketched out, that if these are already valued at a higher rate than other property, you should take that fact into consideration, and that they should be entitled to come in under the same conditions.

1631. At present, am I right in saying that, so far as railways and tramways and mains that run through the streets are concerned, they pay on their full valuation?—I am not prepared to say.

Mr. Walker, Q.C.—I understand that the buildings are valued in full, and the roads at one-fourth.

1632. CHAIRMAN.—Then, of course, if the townships are brought in, it would make no difference, because whatever the railways and tramways pay at present they would continue to pay, and it would be your view that they should continue to pay the same?—Quite so, except that they are more favourably situated in the townships than in Dublin. Let them be subject to the conditions on which they now hold.

1633. That would be important as regards Pembroke township, for supposing the Dublin, Wicklow, and Westland Railway only pay one-fourth of the portion of the line through the city, and that they pay five-sixths in Pembroke, then if they are to be brought into Dublin the company would be getting a considerable advantage, for they would then only be paying one-fourth instead of five-sixths!—I think we are treating all interests very well if we don't increase the burthen on them.

1634. But this would be lessening the burthen considerably!—But I would leave the burthen that is on them.

1635. You would give the railway no advantage for being brought in—on the contrary, you would be putting something on them; you would be putting on one-fourth for the mile in the city, and making them pay five-sixths in the Pembroke district, and therefore you would be making them pay five-sixths of the entire rate in Dublin!—After your explanation I think it would be much better in an amalgamated scheme to wipe out differences, and have a uniform procedure, although advantages and disadvantages might arise.

1636. That might alter these tables made by Mr. O'Donnell very much. He puts down the produce of the rate of Pembroke at £15,007, and then every one knows the Kingstown Railway is valued very highly in that township, and it must pay a very large portion of that £15,007, because paying five-sixths; and if you remember that in Dublin they only pay one-fourth, you instantly wipe out a large portion of that £15,007, and then you make the £15,007 much more, in order to make up the difference!—That compensation did not strike me before. I did not see, that the Pembroke rating being so high, that that would make much difference. I have always seen that the works used for railways have been rated on a different basis from other property.

1637. But I can't see why, if you are all to be brought into one common family, one railway is to be valued at one-fourth and another at five-sixths!—I think it would be better to have uniformity.

1638. You are aware the bridge tax extends over the Metropolitan Police district, plus Clontarf and portion of the Drumcondra township!—Yes.

1639. That is for the purpose of the bridges!—Yes.

1640. Have you formed any opinion whether it would be right and fair that the persons taxed by the Legislature for the support of these bridges should pay anything towards keeping up the roads leading to these

bridges?—It would appear as a natural consequence they ought to pay for the roads.

1641. Is that your opinion?—I have seen in other towns that great works like bridges or embankments, or anything very special, that special rates and special sources of income are adopted other than for the ordinary wear and tear of the city, so that bridges, probably being an almost abnormal expenditure as regards their structural arrangements, should not be provided for in the ordinary way. They are always called upon in London, when an embankment or a work of that kind is on hand, to provide funds from special sources. There are some indirect taxes which make a great many people pay; but there have been no schemes of the kind in the general management of Dublin.

1642. But we have none of the enormous works such as the Thames Embankment!—No; but no one who knows anything of Dublin can shut their eyes to the fact, that a very large portion of the supplies for the surrounding country, down even to Booterstown and Kingstown, are brought from the quays of Dublin, and pass over the bridges, so far as the supplies arriving at the north side are concerned.

1643. Must it not have been with a view to that, and the fact that the bridges were used by these people as well as the inhabitants of Dublin proper, that the tax was spread over this wide area, and if that is so, and if the townships were brought in, would you consider it fair that Booterstown and the surrounding places should pay something towards keeping up the roads which run from these townships to the city, and to the very quays where these supplies come from?—It strikes me that if that great use of the bridges, and if the great traffic caused by these townships did not exist, probably bridges of a less expensive character might answer for the city traffic, and the roads could be kept up for city purposes at less cost. When bridges are made, a great deal of extra demand is made on the people, but that does not refer so largely to roads. The bridges are looked upon as conferring more extended benefit, and therefore the taxation for them might be extended in a more especial manner.

1644. But if you are obliged to enlarge these bridges to meet the traffic caused by these people from the outlying districts, surely the people who pass over the bridges must also pass over the roads as well, and they get the use of the roads without contributing anything towards them!—They may; but then I don't think the use they make of the roads would necessitate the increase of the roads to the same extent.

1645. But doesn't it increase the cost of keeping up the roads?—I don't think that bears any comparison with the first cost of building bridges. However, I only gave that as a reason for the distinction which has been made in London in distinguishing the cost of bridges and embankments from the ordinary wear and tear of the city; and I think the reason is that there entail an exceptionally great expenditure, which is not entailed by the ordinary wear and tear taken alone, without the others.

1646. Mr. Corcoran.—Do you think the Bridge Tax fairly apportioned, do you think it fair that Dalkey should pay for the rebuilding of Carlisle Bridge?—Perhaps not to the same extent as those abutting on the locality of the bridge; but they should pay to some extent.

1647. Dalkey contributes and Dún Laoghaire doesn't!—Perhaps that is due to the fact that Dalkey is more inhabited by people whose business brings them more into town, or something of that kind.

1648. CHAIRMAN.—With regard to the constitution of the Corporation, is it your opinion that, with the present numbers, if the outside districts were brought in, they could do the work at all?—That is a question of extreme difficulty, for in making any new provisions, you must alter the old things; and my idea is that if you amalgamate the townships, you should, for the area added give new members, or spread the existing number over the enlarged area. In either of these arrangements great attention should be paid to the fact that the townships should get, in either case, a

fair representation on the basis on which such representation should be calculated, and whether it be by new members or by a redistribution, that the principle of fairness will be carried out on a proper basis. I am not for increasing the numbers myself. I know, from the evidence before the Select Committee, that some gentlemen thought the work could not be done without ninety members. We know that in England sixty-four is the highest number.

1639. You have sixty here, and I know the evidence before the Parliamentary Committee was that less than ninety could not do the work. What is your view of it?—I think the present number, with the townships as they now stand, extended over the new area, would be sufficient; because I think that the competition which would arise, and the extended area of selection, would give us a lot of people who would be not so much an addition to the number as people who would work for ends which they would wish to attain. On looking at the map, you will see there are areas beyond the townships we propose, which, for the sake of uniformity, should be added; and if there was an extension of that kind, you would, in justice to those areas, require additional members; but for the present, I think the number of sixty well-selected, with a redistribution of wards according to population and valuation, fairly adjusted, is enough.

1640. How would you suggest that that number should be allocated, supposing the number to still remain sixty. There are fifteen wards in the city. Would you allow that number of wards to continue, and reduce the representation of these fifteen wards to fifty say, and then give twenty representations to the new townships, dividing them as best you could into wards; or would you increase the number of wards, or how would you suggest to meet the difficulty; because you can see at once that these are things about which we will have to give some recommendation?—The question is affected in my mind in this way: With the present state of the franchise in Ireland, and the present incidences which regulate the law of the franchise, and which are so unfair to the great mass of the people, I would be very slow to make any changes at all, and I would only contemplate changes in the hope that legislation will soon be made and is inevitable, that will render these inequalities no longer existing. By the arrangements that exist here thousands are disfranchised; the occupiers are not put on the rate-book where the owners pay the rates, and therefore hundreds—I might say thousands—of people are disfranchised, to whom the law, *prima facie*, gives the franchise. There are people who have monthly and weekly tenancies, who may reside in the city for years, but who, from the mere incidence of the payment of the rent and rates, are deprived of their rights. In England there is a different system. No master who pays the rates they are put on, and there is a fine of £2 for every name omitted. I am difficult in speaking of this matter, owing to the difficulties it would involve in this way; but if legislation had a fair basis, my own idea would be that in that way majorities ought to prevail, and I would divide the whole area, and as there would be about 300,000 odd in the whole of the city then, I would divide it into fifteen wards of 20,000 each.

1641. Mr. Corriss.—Do you mean to regard population only and not property?—I speak of population only, for I have not the same ideas of property that some other gentlemen have, for I don't find that the representatives of property always act in that manner, which is for the public benefit. For instance, in Rathfarnham, the great opponents to the introduction of Party water, upon which the lives of the people depended, were the owners of property.

1642. Chairman.—This is very serious for the townships, for unless you are prepared to give them exclusive wards, they might not, perhaps, get men to represent them as at present?—That might, perhaps, be for their benefit.

1643. But they might not think it would be for their

benefit; on the contrary, I am afraid they would be pretty sure to consider it no benefit!—Facts are stubborn things. It has been material for the benefit of other municipalities where such large franchises has existed. All the progress in sanitary matters; in public libraries and wash-houses; in everything that can benefit the municipality has resulted; and they have not selected, as it was feared, large constituencies would, incompetent men. Having no personal interest, and no interest but the public good, they have really selected in the English towns, men who possess high social and intellectual attainments; whereas I don't think the very same class of gentlemen we now see interested in Dublin, with its great people, and its rich people, give that amount of attention to public matters, which men selected from these sources to which I point, have done in other places.

1644. Mr. Corriss.—But suppose the law remained unchanged, what would you do with the included portion as regards representation?—In free of their political disadvantage, I would take them in on the terms we now have, for I believe it will come to this in this city, that people will join for municipal progress and improvement, even while they differ in other things, and that we would work harmoniously in the city, even under the conditions of taking them in as at present.

1645. Mr. Waller, Q.C.—You mean to take them in on the system of calculating population?—I consider property and population both.

1646. Mr. Corriss.—But suppose the law remained unchanged, and that the portions the Corporation propose were taken in, how would you allocate the representation of this included portion?—I would divide the whole area.

1647. Population included?—Yes; into fifteen wards of 20,000 population each.

1648. According to population only?—Yes; for my belief is that even poor wards that have no property, should have representatives to improve their condition, which in some cases is very bad.

1649. CHAIRMAN.—That is your opinion of it; but we have before us, as a thing which we must look to, the recommendation of the Committee of the House of Commons on the subject, and they recommended a proposed division of rates and representation, so that we can't look upon it in the view of population alone. Suppose it to be considered as a question of rates, that is, property and population both to be considered, how would you then suggest to deal with the difficulty. I know your own view is that it should be dealt with according to population?—I would go by population.

1650. You are talking of the existing state of things?—Yes; and I would go by population in the hope that in a very short time the rating of the occupiers would be on the same principle as in England, and that any disadvantage that may accrue now, will be wiped out hereafter.

1651. But suppose others don't agree with you, how would you in the other event deal with the question, supposing property and population are both to be considered, what would be your view with regard to the adjustment of the entire city with the included district?—I did not enter into the scheme of annexation more than from the view of population, and it was more in that view because I have some ideas about property representation that don't coincide with the views of those who base representation on it.

1652. You think sixty members would be a sufficient number of representatives for all?—Yes.

1653. Suppose these townships were brought in, what is you view with regard to the franchises—with them at present it is a totally different thing from what it is in Dublin—would you assimilate the franchises in the townships with the franchise in Dublin or allow things to stay on the same basis as at present, or would you alter the franchise in Dublin to meet the townships?—They are not under a £10 valuation like other cities in England, with six months occupation; but we have apparently a better state of things here, because we are told we have household suffrage, but

DUBLIN.
April 12, 1872.
Mr. Charles
Downes.

BENSON.
April 18, 1878.
Mr. Charles
Boyle.

the household suffrage is contingent upon a three years' residence, and many other disabilities, so that we have an exclusive franchise as you could possibly find. For instance, Dublin has a population of 10,000 more than Leeds, and Leeds has got 53,000 municipal electors, and Dublin has only 8,000. Lincoln, with the same population as Gateshead, has about 1,100 municipal voters, while Gateshead has 10,000, so that that apparently household suffrage is under conditions which are sufficient to render it more narrow than a property qualification.

1654. Your idea with regard to the townships being brought into the franchise, as it is at present in Dublin, is that it should be in this way—an occupier's franchise of £4 with liability to municipal rates, and a period of occupation of not less than a year!—Yes.

1655. The committee of the House of Commons recommended "that the occupiers' franchises should be fixed at the rate of over £4 in all towns carrying with it liability to municipal rates and an occupation of three years"!—My opinion would be I would go further than that and have household suffrage as in England for persons rated at any rate, and in England it is strange to say that every woman has a municipal vote as well as every man—every man or woman rated at any rate for any house.

1656. With regard to the townships if they were brought in you think they should be brought in on that footing if Dublin was put on that footing!—Yes; and I think they should be brought in on the footing of English towns, and the franchise assimilated.

Mr. HORN, Q.C.—We have received a letter from the Town Clerk of Nottingham with reference to what was done there in 1877, and with the permission of the Commissioners I will read it. (Reads.)

"Town Clerk's Department, Municipal Offices,
Nottingham, 9th April, 1879

"The Town Clerk, Dublin.

"Dear Sir—I find that you are making efforts to enlarge the city boundaries. In 1877 we enlarged this borough by taking 8,000 acres of land, and nearly doubling the population. We abolished four local boards and three school boards. If I can be of any help to you in giving evidence

or otherwise I shall be glad to be of service. I can prove that the union of the districts has been immediately for the advantage of the places taken in.

"I am, dear Sir, yours truly,

"SAMUEL GEORGE JOHNSON, Town Clerk."

Dr. Noyeswood.—While we are waiting for Mr. Boyle, who is our next witness, I may call your attention to the provisions of the different townships Acts, which regulate the qualifications of electors. They are different in each Act. The 26th and 27th of Queen, Local and Personal, chap. 72. The Finsbury Act provides that the qualification is to be any person rated three months before the day of election to the yearly value of £10 and upwards. In the Drumcondra and Cloghlin Act it is every male person the owner or lessee of premises and hereditaments to the value of £50 and upwards, or every person who is an occupier to the value of £5 and upwards. In section 18 of the Cloghlin Act it is any male person rated to the relief of the poor at not less than £15, or resident within five miles of the boundary of the township, and rated as owner of £50 property or the occupier of premises at £5, who resides within the town.

CHAIRMAN.—That must have reference to the Commissioners—the persons qualified to sit!

Dr. Noyeswood.—Yes. The qualification of voters is every male person an occupier to the value of £5 or upwards. The New Kilmallock qualification is every male person who is the occupier or immediate lessor rated at not less than £4, or whose name has been on the township books for three months, and rated to the relief of the poor for premises at £4 or upwards.

CHAIRMAN.—Have you any idea whether it was on difference in the valuation or in the principle of the valuation that caused the qualifications to be fixed so differently?—Mr. HORN, Q.C.—It was by a mere whim.

Dr. Noyeswood.—Several of the Acts I drew myself, and they were fixed after conference with the promoters, for local reasons, I suppose.

JAMES BOTTLE, C.E., examined by Dr. Noyeswood.

Mr. James
Bottle, C.E.

1657. You have been Secretary to the Public Health Department since 1846!—Since the application of the Public Health Act to Ireland. I have now been twelve and a half years employed by the Corporation.

1658. And I believe you brought your professional knowledge as an engineer to the advantage of that Committee!—When I entered the editorship of that Committee there was a great deal to do in that respect.

1659. You are also secretary to the Artisans' Dwellings Committee!—I am.

1660. I see you were examined before the Committee of the House of Commons upon the subject of the local government of towns!—Yes.

1661. And especially with reference to the management by the Corporation of Dublin of their Public Health Department!—Yes.

1662. And you stated generally to the members of that Committee, that the management of the Corporation of Dublin, so far as their means went, was, in your opinion, efficient and active!—So far as their funds permitted them to be.

1663. From what source, since you have been secretary, have the funds of that Committee been derived?—Until the 30th November last from the borough fund, and since then from the Improvement rate.

1664. That was in consequence of an order of the Local Government Board following an inquiry on that subject!—Yes, the funds available for the borough fund being utterly inadequate to carry the Act into effect, in fact having been quite exhausted.

1665. At present that Committee is now carrying out the provisions of the Acts codified by the Act of

last session!—Yes, and with a largely increased staff and increased appliances.

1666. I suppose that increase in the staff and appliances has been consequent on the large fund being placed at your disposal!—Soletly.

1667. What staff at present have you!—The staff still told is twenty-six, exclusive of the medical men, but the staff will be raised to forty-one on an arrangement with the Commissioners of Police or the Chief Secretary. That is the increased force of Police for which we have applied for sanitary purposes.

1668. Would you have the goodness to classify your staff!—We have a consulting sanitary officer, a medical officer of health, fifteen medical officers of dispensaries, who are medical officers under the Public Health Act; thirteen inspectors of nuisances, two inspectors of animal food, two collectors of samples of milk and other articles of food for analysis, two disinfectors at the disinfecting chamber, and two men who are employed in fumigating and disinfecting dwellings, and I have one clerk.

1669. You will be able to furnish a detailed statement of what you have now stated!—Yes. (See Appendix No. 16.)

1670. The staff as you have just stated, when brought up to their increased number, would be quite sufficient for the discharge of their duties!—Yes.

1671. CHAIRMAN.—I understand that the staff is simply sufficient for Dublin at present!—Yes; our expenditure has, since the alteration in the incidence of taxation, been increased from £3,300 to £5,160 per annum.

Examination continued.

1673. Assuming that the additions that are suggested were added to the area of Dublin, would your staff be sufficient for the efficient discharge of the sanitary duties in the increased area?—Organized as it is, our staff is capable of expansion to such an extent.

1673. Would the cost of such an increase as you would deem necessary for the discharge of the additional duties be less or more in your opinion than if they were left to separate staffs in each of the townships?—It would be largely diminished. You would relieve the amalgamated area, for instance, of the expenses of an executive sanitary officer, a superintendent medical officer, and others, besides the numerous expenses connected with an office staff. The expenses of the subordinate officers only would be increased. The same means of transporting patients and infected clothing would suffice.

1674. Have they in these townships any means of transferring sick persons to hospital?—Pembroke township has provided admirable means, and Rathmines has not any.

1675. Have they complied with the 140th section of the Act of 1878, which requires them to provide cabs to convey patients to hospital?—No; Rathmines has not. Pembroke has now provided a very admirable means of conveyance; but they have no means of transporting or disinfecting infected articles; they have neither a disinfecting chamber nor disinfecting staff such as we have.

1676. Would the one disinfecting chamber be sufficient for the increased area?—Yes.

1677. They would require additional cabs, and I suppose we could take over their cabs?—Yes.

1678. What hospitals are in these different townships?—There is none in Rathmines; there are two in Pembroke, the Hospital for Incurables and the City of Dublin Hospital.

1679. And to both of these the Corporation contributes?—Yes.

1680. In point of fact, the hospitals to which they contribute are within the Pembroke township?—Yes.

1681. Are you aware whether any corresponding contributions are given by the townships to the hospitals in Dublin?—I am not aware, but I believe there are not.

1682. Are you well acquainted with Rathmines?—I have a general knowledge of it.

1683. Have you a good general knowledge of its sewers and drainage?—I have not an intimate knowledge, I have a general knowledge.

1684. Do you see a sum in that account (produced) for sanitary purposes during the entire year?—I do.

1685. What is it?—£357 8s. 5d.

1686. In it you see there are several sums, not exactly for sanitary purposes—£100 13s. 4d. Public Works Loan Commissioners interest on loans, but for actual sanitary works, sanitary inspection, and such as your Public Health Department expends money upon, what is the exact amount?—About £20.

1687. Do you think that is sufficient for a large town containing so many thousand inhabitants as Rathmines?—It is utterly disproportionate to its population.

1688. And importance?—And importance.

1689. Do you know what amount is expended in Pembroke?—No, I do not.

1690. Or in Kilmainham?—No, I have no means of knowing.

1691. Had you occasion to examine portions of the Rathmines district, such as Lesson-park and Warwick-terrace, and about that locality?—Yes.

1692. Do you know anything of the sanitary condition of that district and its sewerage?—Yes; I lived for some time in Upper Lesson-street, and I know there is a fearful prevalence of typhus.

1693. To what is that attributable?—To the condition of the sewerage.

1694. That is in connexion with the Swan river?—Yes; the sewers and house drains in connexion with the river.

1695. Are you aware there is a large amount of syphilis and other diseases in that district, to which the attention of the Pembroke Commissioners was directed?—Yes.

1696. That river takes the drainage from Rathmines?—Yes.

1697. Is Lesson-park in Rathmines or Pembroke?—In Rathmines.

1698. Is Warwick-terrace in Rathmines or Pembroke?—It is in Rathmines.

1699. Has any means been taken for the rectification of the drainage in these districts?—I am aware there is a scheme of very considerable importance in progress.

1700. That is the one we have heard of?—Yes.

1701. With the outfall at Whitehead?—Yes.

1702. Have applications been made from some of these townships for the use of your sanitary appliances?—Frequently.

1703. Which of them would you specify?—Especially from Rathmines: first, for the conveyance of sick to hospital they use our cabs; and for the disinfection of infected articles they use our chamber, and they have the use of our conveyance for removal of infected articles. We have disinfected many houses at the request of inhabitants of Rathmines by our disinfectors.

1704. Within the township?—Yes; a return can be given of these cases.

1705. CHAIRMAN.—Suppose an accident happens, or a person commits suicide in these districts, where is the inquest held, and who holds it?—The county coroner who holds inquests outside the municipality.

1706. Even in the townships?—Yes; the city coroner's jurisdiction is confined to the municipal area. The Corporation at very great expense erected a coroner's court and morgue—one of the most perfect in the kingdom.

1707. That is one of the things directed by the Public Health Act of 1866, and afterwards by the Act of last year, is there such a thing in the townships?—No.

1708. And what becomes of the body if there is an accident or a suicide?—The inquest is held generally where the accident occurs, sometimes in a shed or place of that kind.

1709. But if an accident occurs in the street for instance, you can't leave the body where the accident occurred?—We have a morgue and a coroner's court, which would be available for the amalgamated area.

1710. DR. NARROW.—The morgue is very generally used?—Yes; about thirty-three bodies are annually deposited in it.

1711. CHAIRMAN.—On that former inquiry on which we were engaged, we found that so far as the morgues and disinfecting were concerned the Public Health Act might as well not have been passed!—We compiled with it in Dublin in 1868. This morgue and coroner's court cost us about £1,400.

1712. DR. NARROW.—You have described them as one of the most complete in the United Kingdom?—Yes; it is considered as one of the most perfect in the United Kingdom; it was built under my own personal direction.

1713. And in every case applications for the use of the morgue have been met?—Yes, instantaneously.

1714. Have applications been made from the townships?—Yes, to a less amount.

1715. Would you think it an advantage to have a central sanitary department?—Yes; I think there should be no imaginary boundary in sanitary matters; I have never confined myself to it when an emergency occurred.

1716. In point of fact, the public look upon your department as the centre, irrespective of boundary?—Yes; the public from within and without the Municipal Boundary, apply to us for information as to the steps to be taken as to the abatement of nuisances, the disinfection of dwellings, &c. We are regarded as a sort of central authority in such matters.

1717. And your opinion is that your department

DUBLIN,
April 16, 1878.
Mr. James
Bryce, M.A.

DUBLIN
April 18, 1876.
Mr. James
Boyle, Q.C.

ought to be extended on the grounds of public benefit—
I am confident that the public would derive much
benefit from it.

1718. Do you think these townships would be
equitably chargeable with the cost of providing a con-
venient home, abbatoirs, and so on?—The benefit
being conferred on the entire area, the expenses in-
sured should be borne uniformly.

1719. How many convictions have you had in your
department?—The number of cases adjudicated per
week is ninety-four on the average, and the number of
cases dismissed is something under one and a half per
thousand.

1720. And you have a return of the fines imposed?—
Yes; they average about £400 a year.

1721. Do you think it would be advantage to have
your legal department, by the law-agent, conducting all
these cases for the increased area?—Certainly, it would
ensure uniformity of practice, and especially it would, I
think, be a great saving in expense, for these separate
adjudications necessarily involve a considerable amount
of expense.

1722. Is there actual inspection of the live stock
under your department?—Yes, in this way—that
whenver cattle are brought into houses or places where
they are intended to be slaughtered, they are inspected
by the sanitary officers.

1723. But there is inspection carried on under the
Markets' Committee in Smithfield and the new Cattle
Market?—Yes, and every animal suspected of disease
or diseased is at once seized.

1724. And that being so, and an inspection being
held under your Market Committee, of course the
townships that depend on the Dublin markets for
their supplies of animal food have the advantage of the
inspection for which the Corporation pays?—Yes, and
it is a great protection to them in that respect.

1725. Most of the surrounding townships, as well as
Dublin, are supplied from the live meat markets of
the city?—Yes, a large amount of the butchers' meat
sold in the townships is killed in Dublin by wholesale
butchers.

1726. And it is subject to continual supervision?—
Yes.

1727. How many tons per annum of meat do you
import?—I could give you a very fair estimate of the
quantity when I tell you we seize and confiscate about
eighty tons.

1728. So you think it would be an advantage to
these townships to have a properly constructed abbat-
toir?—I think a public abattoir would afford an
amount of protection to the consumers of animal food
that would largely contribute to health. I am satisfied
that a great deal of disease is contracted by the use of
diseased meat.

1729. Would one abattoir be sufficient?—No, I
don't think it would be. I think one would not be
sufficient for the city, but I believe two would be suffi-
cient for the city and suburban districts.

1730. You say that at present a large portion of the
animal food consumed in the townships is slaughtered
and prepared in the city?—Yes. I believe there are
four or five slaughter-houses in the Pembroke town-
ship, but I don't think there is one in Rathmines; their
animal food must therefore be supplied from some other
quarter.

1731. And obviously from the city?—Obviously
from the city.

1732. You don't know of any slaughter-houses in the
Rathmines township?—I don't think there is one there.
I heard there was one sometime ago.

1733. With regard to getting another site for a dis-
infecting chamber, have you found much difficulty in
getting sites for the morgue and disinfecting chamber
and so on?—Yes, when we had a chamber partly
erected there was a memorial, and such influence was
brought to bear that we were obliged, after incurring
considerable expense, to remove to another site. We
were met with difficulties of the same character as to

the morgue. Wherever a site was selected we were
met with difficulty.

1734. And the same with regard to the Convalescent
Home?—Yes.

1735. Do you know anything about the facts connected
with the man drainage of Rathmines?—No; I
would rather not speak on that subject. There are
others more competent to do so than I am.

1736. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—Are you aware there are
five licensed slaughter-houses in Rathmines?—No; I
heard there was one, but that it had been closed.

1737. There are five. Is Dublin deficient in slaughter-
houses?—There are thirty-seven in Dublin; there are
too many, there should not be one in it.

1738. Do you approve of the disinfecting chamber,
or would you be in favour of burning the infected
articles?—For certain diseases, such as small-pox, I
prefer burning, but in other diseases I think the chamber
is effective; with a temperature of 300 no animal or vegetable can survive.

1739. You think thirty-seven sufficient, and you
would have no abattoirs in the city?—No.

1740. There is nothing so material as efficient drainage
for sanitary purposes?—It is one of the first conditions.

1741. Can you give us an estimate of how much was
spent in Dublin under the Main Drainage Act of
1871?—I would rather refer you to the City Engineer,
in whose department it more particularly belongs.

1742. You are a very efficient officer, and I say it
sincerely, but don't you think [that] if you were
appointed head of this large sanitary staff it would be
reasonable to increase your salary?—I don't think you
could expect the work to be done for nothing.

1743. Don't you think the staff would look for an
increase of salary also?—No; it would be more an increase
of subordinate than of salary.

1744. You think it would be more an increase of
subordinates with an increase of salary to the chief?—
That ought to follow.

1745. Dr. Norwood.—In what position is the arti-
sans' dwellings project at present?—The position at
present is that we have our draft award for the
Government arbitrator on Saturday.

1746. Mr. Corriss.—For both districts?—No; for
the Coburg district, with regard to the Boyne-street
area the work has been almost completed by the de-
struction and depopulation of the dwellings—the
population has been reduced to nearly one-third what
it had been.

1747. Then are you not going to apply the Act
there?—I should say not.

1748. Dr. Norwood.—Do you consider the erection
of these artisans' dwellings a benefit to the surround-
ing townships?—Most unquestionably.

1749. The artisans employed in these townships are
drawn from Dublin?—Yes.

1750. And discharge their duties out there?—Yes.
The artisan class are anxious to live in Dublin, for
when employed in the suburban districts of the city
they receive an extra payment.

1751. Is there any place in the townships where
they could reside?—No. The accommodation for them
in the Pembroke township is very limited.

1752. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—Do you mean really to say
there is no accommodation in Rathmines?—I say the
accommodation for the working classes in Rathmines
and Pembroke is very scanty and very indifferent.

1753. Mr. Corriss.—You have got a good many
members of the police force acting under you?—Yes.

1754. There is a portion of the yellow colour'd dis-
trict on the map proposed to be taken in which is outside
the police district altogether. Could they act in
that district?—They could by the consent of the Com-
missioners.

1755. They would have the same powers?—The
powers they exercise for us are conferred by the San-
itary Act and not by the Police Act, and their powers
as constables are not involved in any of our districts.

except in one respect that they have power to arrest under certain circumstances.

1754. They would not have that power outside the Metropolitan Police district!—No; but it is very rarely exercised—not more than three or four times in the year.

1755. CHAIRMAN.—From being at the head of the sanitary staff, you must know whether or not the artisan class who work in the townships do reside in Dublin principally?—They do.

1756. I suppose then there must be from time to time a very considerable amount of sickness and pauperism amongst that class?—There is.

1757. And that prevails altogether on the Dublin hospitals and the Dublin institutions?—We suffer very severely from that fact. As the artisan class dwell almost entirely in Dublin, we are burdened with them when they become sick, and from their improvidence they are without employment and without means.

1758. It is human nature to suppose that that class will go to the cheapest place, and that will be the worst localities, and there are no such places to be found in the townships!—You have mentioned a fact that bears more on our duties than any other that I have heard—the tendency to seek the cheapest kind of accommodation without any regard to comfort or decency. That is one of the most serious difficulties we have to deal with in the city. The great difficulty we have with the working classes is to advance their ideas in sanitary matters—our duty is to force them into a more comfortable class of houses, as they should pay more in house rent, and less in drink. In order to show how the supply of house accommodation for the artisan class affects the city after the city as to its death-rate, I may mention that the population of Dublin is sixty-five to the acre; in the Pembroke township it is fifteen, and in Rathmines fourteen, the amount of air space is therefore greater in the townships. If the artisan and labouring class are scattered our space would be greatly increased. We have been moving in that direction by the depopulation of houses. Under the operations of the Public Health Committee since the application of the Act, we have depopulated 930 houses, with an average population of nine or ten to each.

1759. The inhabitants of these have been compelled to crowd up more in these other localities?—Yes. I will give you one of its results: In depopulating these houses we have driven the occupants into a better class of house, the number of tenement houses in Dublin since the application of the Act has increased from about 9,000 to 9,700. There is nearly the same proportion of new tenement houses and houses depopulated.

1760. Then they crowded into the next cheapest and worst when you put them out of one description of houses?—Yes.

1761. What is your experience of these people crowded into these rooms—what is the number of cubic feet of air they have?—Under the Public Health Act bye-laws for the regulation of houses occupied by more than one family assign a minimum of 300 cubic feet of air to each person. On measuring some of the rooms we found from 106 to 129 feet, and 107 or 108 others, in which the air space allowed for each was under 200 cubic feet. The occupants were, of course, compelled to occupy additional rooms, and overcrowding, as a rule, does not now exist. Exceptional cases do occur. The altitude of the tenement houses cannot fail to affect the health of the occupants. In proportion to the number of stories in the tenement houses in the amount of sickness and of mortality among its inhabitants; the people will not go down to bring up water, they will not carry slops down, and the higher the house the more difficult it is to introduce any sanitary improvements; the exhibitions from the lower part of these houses are usually foul, reaching the upper floors, they are there arrested. The higher the floor the more poisonous is the atmosphere.

1762. Then the upper part is worse than the lower part?—Certainly. Then there is a great dislike to ventilation, and the people habitually keep their windows shut.

1763. And they have a great dislike to cleanliness?—In their habits we have most to contend with.

1764. You were asked about slaughter-houses and abattoirs; why have not the Corporation provided them?—I have this morning revised a report of a select committee on slaughter-houses with the view to its being sent on from the Public Health Committee to the Council for adoption, urging the abolition of every slaughter-house and the erection of abattoirs.

1765. Don't you think the condition of slaughter-houses in certain parts of Dublin must materially contribute to its unhealthiness?—Our difficulty is not appreciated in that matter. Under the Act of 1848, as amended in 1861, all the slaughter-houses which were registered before the Act of 1851 had vested rights. These rights must be extinguished, and the owners compensated, but before that can be done the Corporation must have provided abattoirs.

1766. Although you can't abolish them, don't you think the Rathmines people might fairly say, "don't ask us to touch a place where they have slaughter-houses in this condition, and where you can see as you pass the blood running out of them?"—They will be deprived of any plea on that ground very soon.

1767. The Rathmines people will be telling us next week that there is a great Corporation going on without improving the slaughter-houses, and letting the streets be in a shocking condition; for in William-street and at the back of Ormond-quay no one could go into the market there without seeing what is running into the channels!—The Public Health Act of 1878 gave us powers we had not before, and we have now power to deal with slaughter-houses in a manner we could not deal with them before.

1768. That Act passed last year, and have you benefited much since?—We have as much as circumstances would permit. It was only recently that the incidence of taxation was changed, and since then the committee have applied themselves energetically to the work.

1769. Having regard to what you add about the artisans, and we know that when there is a large poor population there is must be more or less sickness and disease, is it your opinion that the better class in these townships are as much interested in taking care of that artisan class as those living in the heart of the city?—Certainly.

1770. Seeing that they come into it every day?—And that they convey disease backwards and forwards. All who reside in the area are equally interested in the health of those who live in the city.

1771. Dr. Morwood.—It is practically all one city?—Yes; it is practically one city; the boundary is an imaginary one.

1772. Have you a printed return of the convictions resulting from your operations for ten years?—I have.

1773. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—What is to be the cost of the abattoir?—It is estimated £12,000.

1774. And where is it to be?—It is proposed to be near the New Cattle Market; there is much difficulty in obtaining ground elsewhere.

1775. Is that to be the sole abattoir?—It will be tested, and if it is found to be insufficient another will be erected.

1776. For the other side of the city?—Yes.

1777. Mr. Corlett.—If the townships are taken in you said it would be necessary to have another?—Certainly.

1778. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—Where would you propose the second?—Near to the east in the neighbourhood of Grand Canal-street, or some district lying to the east.

1779. On the same scale?—No, it would not cost so much; the abattoir on the north side, being near the New Cattle Market, would necessarily be more

DUBLIN.
April 11, 1878.
Mr. James
Boyle, Q.C.

DUBLIN,
April 10, 1878.
Mr James
Boyle, Q.C.

extensively used. A great improvement will be effected by it in preventing the driving of cattle through the streets.

1782. CHAIEZMAN.—At the same time, if you prevent their being driven through the streets you will prevent the streets being dirtied; but then you must carry them in carts, which will injure the streets in other

ways!—The abattoirs and the by-laws, now being framed, will suppress among others the indecent practice of carrying uncovered carcasses along the thoroughfares.

1783. You have an unlimited supply of water, which is a great advantage in regard to abattoirs!—Yes; there is no limit to its amount.

Alderman Harris examined by Mr. Heron, Q.C.

1784. I believe you are Chairman of the General Purposes Committee!—Present chairman

1785. Have you property both in the city and in Pembroke!—No; I have got property in the city, but I reside in Pembroke.

1786. You reside at 13, Wellington-road!—Yes.

1787. In reference to the state of the roads and footways in the townships, what is your opinion!—The state of the road on which I reside, and those in the neighbourhood, could not possibly be worse. The road where I live at present is in a positively dangerous condition in consequence of a ridge in the middle of the road, which has been there a long time. A horse was thrown down the other day, and both his knees were broken as well as the straps. The road is badly scavenged, and the footpaths bad. On Waterloo-road, which has got the advantage of a tramway, the sides of the road are kept in a very bad condition. Parties on the side going up are in a worse condition; and in wet weather, Lower-street is impassable; there is no means of getting across at all.

1788. Are the waterways kept in any order!—There are no paved channel crossings at all.

1789. How is the water at each side of the road got rid of!—There is a g�ating at one end of the road, and the water percolates in the best way it can to the g�ating.

1790. As regards those roads, are there any proper arrangements for carrying off the waste water!—I don't think there are any. There are no paved channel crossings whatever, and even the channel crossings that we have are not scavenged. To keep them clean we have no scavengers on that road. I have not seen a scavenger there for many months. There may be in my absence, of course, but I don't see the result of their work.

1791. Does that apply to the roads farther away from Dublin!—It does certainly. Of course there are other roads on which the traffic is not so great, and they don't want so much to keep them up as those near Dublin.

1792. In reference to the lighting of the township, is it properly conducted and managed!—The lamps of the township are extinguished at a comparatively early hour in comparison with the city.

1793. When are they extinguished!—I really can't tell the exact hour at which they are extinguished—either twelve or one o'clock.

1794. Have you considered the question of including the townships within the boundary of the city!—I have.

1795. State to the Commissioners your opinion and your reasons for it!—I think that, though as they are really continuations in every possible way of the city, the people who live in the townships should participate in the municipal burthen of those who happen by an arbitrary line to live within the municipality. For instance, I live in a terrace of seven houses, and that, I think, gives a very good idea of the general residents of the townships. In the first house of that terrace there lives Professor Ingram, a Fellow of Trinity College, whose sole avocation will be in Trinity College: the second one is occupied by the son of the late Chief Baron Piggott. He, I believe, has an office under the Crown.

1796. That is the Master of the Court of Exchequer!—I believe so. The third house is occupied by Captain Butler, who is, I believe, a country gentleman, and whose avocations don't lead him into the city. I believe he lives there for the purpose of attending

court, and that sort of thing. The fourth house is occupied by a gentleman who has retired from any active occupation. The fifth by a gentleman who fills a situation in the Masonic Hall; the sixth by myself; and the seventh by Mr. Leggo, Chief Clerk in the Court of Exchequer. So that out of the seven, four are gentlemen intimately connected with the city of Dublin, and live there simply on account of proximity to the city, and for carrying on their avocations within it. I myself live there also, but I contribute to municipal taxes through my city penances.

1797. I have asked you with reference to Pembroke and Rathmines; what about Clontarf!—There is a most decided opinion about Clontarf. It was a matter simply discussed, and we came to the conclusion unanimously in the Corporation that it would not be advisable to annex Clontarf, and the reasons are these—that it is not continuous, as can be seen by the map; it is not part of the municipality of Dublin as the others are; it extends along the seaboard for a considerable distance, and it is not continuous with the city. There is no town in Clontarf, no streets or squares, nor are there any roads such as Wellington, Pembroke, or Raglan roads. It is divided from the municipality by a manorial demesne, which must be a third of a mile or more long, and that cannot be turned into building ground for many years to come, for it happens to be, a large portion of it, the property of the city of Dublin.

1798. With reference to the fire brigade organization what is your opinion!—I think it is manifest, and it doesn't require a second opinion on the point, that the fire brigade should be extended to the largest area it possibly could, in connection with the valuable properties in the townships; and another point is, that when those gentlemen who don't reside in Dublin, but only occupy tenements in the city, leave it at night and go out to their country houses, the care of these property is wholly confined to the citizens of Dublin who pay for the protection of this property, and the owners contribute nothing. As an instance of that, I may perhaps put in this return. Now there are Nos. 1 and 2, Foster-place, according to the valuation in the Directory these premises are valued at £120 a year—that is, for the two houses, Nos. 1 and 2. I find there are no less than sixteen firms carrying on business in these houses. I will give their names: (1.) Wm. Gee, DeBretin and Sons, Government Stock and Sharebrokers, Agents to the Liverpool and London, and Globe Insurance Companies, and to the Original Guarantee Society, London.—Wm. Gee, DeBretin, Esq., J.P., resides at 11, Albany-road, Merrion, and Ballymaloe House, Ballybrack; and his son, Francis E. DeBretin, Esq., at Glanloch Lodge, Killiney. (2.) Messrs. Hone and Murray, Stockbrokers—Joseph Hone, Esq., resides at 57, Pembroke-road; Edward Murray, Esq., resides at 64, Morehampton-road. (3.) Messrs. Townley Wm. Hardman and Sons, Clothiers—Townley Wm. Hardman, Esq., resides at Albion, Newtownpark-avenue, Blackrock. (4.) Geo. Wm. Towell, Commissioner agent—Geo. Wm. Towell resides at 15, Belgrave-road, Rathmines. (5.) Mathew J. White, Solicitor—Mathew J. White resides at 14, Belgrave-square, Rathmines. (6.) P. J. O'Laughlin, Solicitor; he resides at Duamore, Tralee. (7.) J. J. Monzia, Ceramist agent; I can't

DUBLIN
April 20, 1870
Alfredus
Harris.

find where he lives. (8.) N. Petersen and Sons, public accountants and auditors. N. G. Petersen resides at 39, Kentworth-road, Rathgar; L. E. Petersen resides at 18, Beechwood-avenue, Ranelagh. (9.) Cummins and Co., public accountants. Charles Cummins, Esq., resides at Dalkey. (10.) D. M. Smyth, commission agent, wine and spirit broker; I have not been able to find where he lives. (11.) O'Loughlin and Sons and Co., public auditors and accountants; residence 14, Upper Rutland-street. (12.) Wm. Pitt, agent to the Liverpool and London and Globe Plate-glass, Guarantees, and Accidental Insurance Co. Wm. Pitt resides at Leinster-road, Rathmines. (13.) The Dublin Widows' Fund Society; the secretary, W. J. Stokes, Evans and Handycroft. (14.) The Arterial Drainage and Improvement of Land Co., Ireland; and (15.) The American Mining and Real Estate Co., W. N. Denning, secretary, and about these I don't know anything. Here is a case where a large number of men are doing business, many of them able to drive their own conveyances, using the streets of Dublin, and practically contributing nothing whatever to the municipal burdens. The same thing applies to the Commercial Buildings, which are valued at £550, and I know, as a matter of fact, that the Chamber of Commerce alone pay upwards of £400 a year for the portion they occupy, and the remainder is occupied by twenty gentlemen, not two of whom have residences within the city.

1799. Is there any other illustration of the same character in reference to that point?—The whole Directory abounds in them. There are the Commercial Buildings and Leinster Chambers in Dame-street. It is a well known fact that these gentlemen, although they say they pay it in the rent, that is quite a fallacy, for the valuation is based on what the lower portion of any house in Dublin would let for, and even sometimes these houses are held at lower valuations.

1800. CHAIRMAN.—How do you say they pay it in the rent?—That is their argument.

1801. The Leinster Chambers, for instance, are only valued at £120, and if you take the number of gentlemen who have offices there, twenty-nine, it will give very little for each!—That is what I complain of.

1802. Mr. Horan, Q.C.—They cannot pay in the aggregate a very large rent in proportion to what is charged for the house. Have you considered the artisans' dwellings question at all?—Only generally, not particularly.

1803. Have you considered, supposing annexation is to take place, upon what terms the townships should be annexed with Dublin as regards representation?—I think with the present representation of Dublin, or something near it, it might involve, perhaps, the addition of a few members to the present Council; but I think, with that exception, we could do very well with the representation of between sixty and seventy members of this house. But, at the same time, the general Act, as far as it makes the quorum one-third, should be altered. We find that a very unworkable quorum, indeed, and too large. I believe by the Act of Parliament it is not the number but the relative proportion of one-third that is named in all these corporate bodies as the quorum, and that leaves us with a quorum of twenty, and the consequence is that, having a great deal of business to do, any obstructionist in the house might prevent a large amount of routine business by calling attention to the fact that there were not twenty members present.

1804. Amongst the plans suggested in case of amalgamation is one for taking a ward from the fifteen wards in the city, distributing the representatives amongst the new townships!—I think the principle is a correct one, but I would not draw a hard and fast line that we should be confined to sixty numbers. It might be advisable to extend the number by five or six members, in order to equalise the matter, and give fair representation to all the parties concerned.

1805. CHAIRMAN.—But if it is the case that the largest Corporation in England has only sixty-four members, with a very much larger district in popula-

tion, would it be reasonable in Dublin to give more?—There are a great many different interests to be consolidated in Dublin, and I would imagine they should be all fairly represented, and what I would propose would not be to say great extent, only I would not confine myself to the hard and fast line of sixty men.

1806. Suppose you went up as far as seventy, how would you redistribute the seventy?—I have made a calculation in my own mind what the basis of any amalgamation would be. A revaluation both of the city and of the townships I believe would be the first thing to be done, and I have come to the conclusion that the city would represent three-fourths of the aggregate valuation, and that the existing townships would at present represent one-fourth; and I believe that would represent them in population as well as valuation, so that you would have three-fourths of the representation for the city and one-fourth to be distributed in whatever way would be fair and proper to the annexed townships. That, I really think, would be a fair basis both as to population and valuation.

1807. According to the present figures, you appear to be quite right in what you say. Would it be your view to leave the wards of the city as they are at present, dividing amongst them the three-fourths of whatever would be the number of Town Councillors, and then allocating to the other townships the remaining one-fourth?—Yes.

1808. Then the townships should be divided into wards!—Practically that would be my idea, and there may be cases where some of the existing districts should be absorbed into existing wards, but practically would be what you state.

1809. In recasting the representation of the wards in that way, would it be your idea that the wards in the city should be equalised, because I know by the return that the valuation and population of some of them are very different; for instance, the lowest has a valuation of about £29,000, and the highest about £47,000. The ward that has the valuation of £29,000 has as large a representation at this moment as the ward with a valuation of £47,000. Would you allow things to remain as they are in the city, or would you propose there should be a recasting of the wards according to the valuation of the wards?—I have no doubt whatever that at the time these wards were cast, as they at present exist, there must have been some political element introduced into the recasting of them, and as I think the whole matter would be opened up if the principle was established that would be a matter of detail. There are so many circumstances and elements to come into consideration, that I am not prepared to answer whether the existing wards, as existing wards, should be redistributed or not.

1810. Before this inquiry closes, it would be very well if we could have the views of the Corporation on that point, bearing in mind the fact that there occurs here what occurred in other places—for instance, in Cork, the wards varied in valuation from £16,000 to £33,000; here you have £29,000 and £45,000, and the question is, whether in any recommendations you would ask us to make in this case there should be any rectification of these wards so as to equalise the valuation of them!—We are very peculiarly situated, and this is a question I don't want to go into extensively. We are very peculiarly situated in reference to English and other boroughs, and political questions might arise out of this which I am not prepared at present to answer, for the whole arrangement of the wards would depend largely on what the ultimate result of this Commission would be as to the rearrangement of the boundaries.

1811. You say that political questions might arise; but putting them out of the case altogether!—You cannot in Dublin.

1812. The moment you bring that element into the matter at all, then you open up a very large question with regard to bringing in the townships at all. If you can't deal with Dublin Corporation without taking political matters into consideration, then you must approach the annexation of the townships in a different

DUBLIN.
April 16, 1873.
—
Alderman
Harris.

way from what you approach the question in other cities. There is nothing in the report of the Select Committee going into political matters. This is a municipal matter, for the benefit of the public and the good of the citizens, who are members of a common family. What right have political considerations to come into it? We are only to see how the rates are to be best levied, and how the city is best to be kept up, and as you now introduce it, keep up exclusive of political matters altogether. People when they come into this hall to consider these questions, should do so irrespective of political parties entirely, anxious only to do the best for the members of the common family for whom they have to act—I may tell you that is the feeling of the members who come here. They come here for the express purpose of doing their best for the citizens at large; and with reference to the redistribution of the wards, as at present existing, I do not think there would be any necessity for change, although it might appear from your questions. There is no doubt whatever it would be more uniform to plan out such new wards, with uniform valuation; but I think the present system of wards, if we are to remain as we are, works very well.

1813. With the system of sending in representatives from the different wards, is it right that eight persons should represent a ward valued at £25,000, and that the ward with £45,000 valuation should only have the same number of representatives?—You are only taking one point of view into account. You are taking the question of valuation, but you must also take the question of population. The people have as much right to be represented as the property.

1814. It is with reference to that that I would be very glad to know the views of the Corporation. For instance, now, I find Merchant's-quay Ward is valued at £80,354 18s. 4d.—That is a very large ward.

1815. And the North Dock Ward is valued at £63,367 10s. 4d.—That arises from the fact that an enormous number of railways converge into the North Wall, which did not previously exist, and in the extent of the population it is not so large—the population is sparse.

1816. Then the North City Ward has a valuation of £42,000 4d.—That is a very small ward, one of the smallest in Dublin. The area is only fifty-seven acres, and still it is one of the highest-valued wards in Dublin.

1817. The Royal Exchange Ward is valued at £44,323 1d.—That is a small ward, so far as population is concerned.

1818. The South City Ward is valued at £49,531 1d.—That is one of the smallest wards in the city. It doesn't extend more than fifty-one or fifty-two acres, and it is very small in population, for nearly the whole of the people sleep out of it.

1819. The South Dock Ward is valued at £49,600 1d.—That is a very extensive ward, and has a large population, as well as a high residential value. I have the honour to represent it.

1820. Is it right that that ward should only have the same number of representatives as the smallest?—I believe it will be found that Merchant's-quay Ward, in point of population, will exceed that of South Dock.

1821. Mr. CORCORAN.—You mean the absolute number of people, and not the ratepayers?—The absolute number of people—perhaps the ratepayers also; for the franchise in Dublin is very low, and there might be a large number in Merchant's-quay. We have three sides of Morris-square, Baggott-street, and Mount-street, and the works on Rogerson's-quay, in the South Dock Ward. I have here the area of the Arran-quay Ward, taken from Thom's Directory, page 1375: 547 statute acres, the valuation £32,000; the North City area, 82 acres, and the valuation £41,000. The population of Arran-quay Ward, although valued at £32,000, is 27,000; whereas the population of the North City is only 16,000. That was in 1861; and in 1871 the population of Arran-quay Ward was 26,720, and of the North City, 11,527; thereby proving our case, that the difference between the two arises because those people, being

men of means, have migrated into the outlying townships. The South Dock Ward has an area of 584 acres, a valuation of £45,790, and the population, 14,426; whereas Merchant's-quay Ward has an area of 314 acres, a valuation of £25,000, and a population of 20,576; thereby showing that the valuation and the population should be both taken into consideration with reference to representation.

1822. Mr. HERON, Q.C.—Have there been any complaints at all in reference to the present arrangement of the fifteen wards within the boundaries?—I think all the wards in Dublin are really well marked and defined, with the exception of one ward, the Mansion House Ward. It lies in a curious struggling direction, and that is the only ward to which my attention was practically called as being badly arranged. Another question with reference to the arrangement of the townships is that one of the most important and greatest difficulty we have to contend with at present is getting rid of the scavenging material of the city. There we are bound in by an iron ring, and if the townships were made part of the municipality I have no doubt whatever we would find means of getting rid of and depositing elsewhere the vast and accumulating difficulty we are at present met with.

1823. CHAIRMAN.—There again the townships may say—I don't know whether they will or will not, but they may say—We totally object to have all the refuse of Dublin, for which you can't find room yourselves, thrown into our township, and we are not to be made part of the family for the purpose of getting all your abomination!—The abomination is all valuable matter. At the present moment we can get rid of it to any amount in the shape of valuable manure, which is the only thing the evil can arise from, but the refuse we can't get rid of is the road stuff, and that is a constantly increasing quantity, of which we can't dispose. The other is all valuable for farmers, and no difficulty arises about it.

1824. Mr. HERON, Q.C.—In the progress of the paving of the city that useless stuff will diminish.—Not only that, but the stuff we will get off the pavement will be all valuable. There is another important question which has been started frequently with reference to building in the city of Dublin. There is one gentleman who is not here now, but who has heretofore taken an active part almost always in antagonism to the Corporation; but notwithstanding his antipathies and complaints of the Corporation, he and his brother have built whole streets of houses within the municipal boundaries, so that he was not deterred by the things he said existed against the Corporation from building in the city—that was Mr. F. Stokes.

1825. What class of houses?—Kingstown Park and all that neighbourhood. In fact there was not accommodation within the city for the class of people who were seeking accommodation, and who were obliged to seek it outside the city.

1826. Mr. WALTER, Q.C.—He never built a house in Dublin!—If not, he and his brother are very large speculators in house property in that neighbourhood.

1827. Mr. HERON, Q.C.—Have you paid any attention to the question of the valuation of the mains and the cost of them, which was increased of course to enable the city to supply the outlying townships?—Yes; one would think it unexpectedly came upon us; at least not us, for I was not a member of the Corporation at the time, but it was not the idea, nor was it contemplated that there would be any rates levied off water mains in the city of Dublin, which were introduced for the benefit of the citizens, and I may say for the benefit of the whole country and district lying about, for the water has made the whole place habitable, but the lawyeers found a hitch in the Act of Parliament, and the consequence is that our water mains have been made liable for annual rating in the city. They are valued at £11,700. I don't know on what basis that is, but I believe they were capitalized. The valuation is largely increased by reason of our having taken the pre-

sections so that when necessary the outlying townships might avail themselves of the supply. These mains were made to pay a much higher rate than they would otherwise have to pay. For the purpose of giving these townships the advantage of water we pay about £4,000 a year.

1828. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—Aren't you getting the benefit of that, and aren't you paid for the water except as to Bathmills?—No; and I will tell you why. When the Bill was passing through Parliament in consequence of the opposition the Corporation were forced or coerced to make terms with the Pembroke people, giving them water at 8/-d.; at that time it was not contemplated we were to pay say rates on these water mains. They have got all the benefit and only pay 8/-d., while we are obliged to pay their poor rate for the mains passing through their district.

1829. Then you have not only to pay the poor rate, but the police tax for all?—I am not able to inform you as to that.

1830. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—In Bathmills you pay all the rates on your mains?—I don't know that. I may mention one extraordinary fact, that while the water mains of the city which are carried on for the advantage of the citizens in the outlying districts as well, are valued at £11,700, their total income being not more than £50,000; the gas mains, from which a profit of nearly £90,000 is derived, are only valued at £3,700.

1831. In reference to the borough fund debt?—With reference to the borough fund, and the effect on the city liability, there is a debenture debt of £190,000 in round numbers. You seemed to think it was high, but the estate is worth £750,000. There was a case mentioned of a house valued at £100, and for which the tenant offered £3,600, being nearly thirty years' rental on the occupation rent. With reference to the debenture date of the city, it is about £190,000; and keeping in view the large increase which will take place within the next two or three years in the city rental, I have an idea that that debt could practically be extinguished altogether; so if the townships were brought in, we could present them with a clean bill of health, so far as the city estate is concerned. In any case, within the next two years, property will fall in worth £8,000 a year; and it is the custom, and not only the custom, but the rule, that the last year's rent of the term, whether it be thirty-one or seventy-five years, shall be paid down and remain over to the last, besides that we get the current year's rent. It is a natural and fair thing, as that is not part of the current revenue, that the debenture debt should be reduced to the extent of that last year's rent, and that that should form a sinking fund, to be revived from year to year; and from a calculation I have made, I find that by the expiration of these leases in thirty-one years and seventy-five years, this would have extinguished the whole of the debenture debt in Dublin.

1832. CHAIRMAN.—That is by compound interest?—You are not deprived for one moment of your annual income.

1833. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—Is there any financial reason at all to prevent the union between the city and the townships—any financial reason that would operate injuriously on the townships?—Quite the contrary; I consider that the townships would be getting large advantages by the union. As far as the fixed charges are concerned on the Corporation estate, they would be getting large advantages; they would have a large balance in their favour. The waterworks debt I look upon as a debt completely extinguished itself by the operation of the sinking fund in thirty-one years.

1834. With reference to the cattle market bonds, there is a sum of £34,000; what of that?—I think as soon as the committee who have charge of that take it practically up, there is ample funds wherewith that shall be paid by the revenue which arises from

the cattle market. It should be a self-supporting and a self-revolving concern.

1835. In reference to the main drainage scheme having failed, it is stated that the credit of the city has been to a certain extent injured?—In what way the credit?

1836. In regard to the finances, they are supposed not to have been sufficient—I don't quite understand the question.

1837. The main drainage scheme has not been persevered in?—No.

1838. And are you aware that a report was spread that the credit of the city was not considered sufficient by the Government to lend the money on?—I am not aware of that. As to the credit of the city I think it is ample; but as to the advisability of saddling it with such an enormous debt, that was another question. I have not at all made up my mind as to the main drainage question.

1839. Mr. Kilkenny.—I appear on behalf of certain taxpayers in Clontarf who are anxious to see that township included in the city. Do you think Clontarf would not also derive advantages from being brought into the municipality?—Certainly, I think it would, if I might be permitted to go into the question of the borough rate that was struck. A question was put yesterday by Mr. Walker to give the estimate upon which the borough rate was struck for sanitary purposes. Well, I may tell you at once, that the borough rate was struck for sanitary purposes, and that it would have been utterly impossible in the then state of the borough fund to have carried on sanitary operations in the city any longer unless there had been some assistance given to it. The borough fund had run into debt on account of sanitary expenditure, through a series of, I think, twelve years. They had spent upwards of £30,000 in sanitary expenditure, which had altogether been charged, and in that way No. 3 Committee—the Finance Committee, were not anxious to go before the citizens and say we want a borough rate for prospective expenditures; they, in fact, had not the hardihood and they allowed themselves to drift into the position of being £5,000 or £6,000 in debt, and the consequence was that they could not go on any further paying sanitary expenditure, and an estimate was made; but I may tell you at once that the estimate was simply made for the purpose of meeting the requirements of the Act of Parliament. Our late law agent, the late Francis Morgan, unknown to most members of the Corporation, had introduced a clause proposing to spend £2,000 on some erection of his own about artisans' dwellings in Baldoyle, and we were brought into the Court of Queen's Bench on the question, and it was shown there that no borough rate could be struck unless for prospective expenditure, and that not one shilling of the rates could be applied towards expenditure that was past, and the consequence was that in face of this fearful outbreak of small-pox, only that providentially the incidence of taxation was changed, we could not have expended one single shilling to stop it, and if a £5 note could have stopped the epidemic, we could not have spent it to save the city, owing to the construction put upon it; but, fortunately, owing to the passing of the Act, and the exertions of Councillor Gray, the incidence was changed, and we are now placed in a different position. The consequence is that the borough fund, which was then £5,000 in debt, will be only about £1,500 in debt at the end of this year, and next year it will be able again to bear its proportion of the sanitary outlay.

1840. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—Are you aware there is a proposal to widen certain streets for the benefit of the Bathmills townships?—I don't know that it is exactly for the benefit of the township; but it is because of the Bathmills township it has been proposed. For instance, Redmond's-hill and Wexford-street, two very narrow guns of streets, which are the main arteries of that large and important suburb of Bathmills are very narrow, and in the Improvement Bill of 1877,

DUBLIN,
April 10, 1878.
Addressed
Burns.

DUBLIN,
April 18, 1879.
Alderman
Harris

which was thrown out on some informality, one of the points was that these streets should be widened. We perfectly well know that for the people of that portion of Dublin the widening of these two streets was not necessary, if it was not for the advantage of the citizens who passed through them.

1841. In reference to the extension of the boundaries have you considered the question as affecting Dublin jurors—I think it would be a very great advantage to the men in the outlying districts that they should all become city jurors. At the present time I am subject to the inconveniences of being one day summoned as a county juror and on another day as a city juror.

1842. Are you aware there has been an agitation going on and report of the Dublin Jurors' Association in reference to this question of extending the district from which city jurors would be taken?—Yes.

1843. And that is the opinion of most mercantile men in the city?—Certainly; the fact is, that with reference to the finances of the Corporation of Dublin I don't see any reason why, with the security they offer, they could not be able to get their loans on as good terms (putting the Public Works Loan Commissioners out of the question) as the Corporation of Leeds. They have got all their money at 4 per cent., and their bonds even at 4 per cent. are at a premium of £2 or £3. There is no better security in the world than we offer.

1844. What is your view as to Carlisle Bridge?—A great many questions have been asked here why should not the same principle be extended to the roads leading up to the bridge itself, but it strikes me the answer to that is this; that we felt the difficulty, and it being admitted by the legislature that it was a gross injustice upon the citizens of Dublin that they should construct these bridges which were to be used by the country at large, to remedy what appeared to be a gross hardship the temporary expedient was adopted by making it an Act of Parliament.

1845. Are you aware that the expense of the construction of the quay walls of the city under the Port and Docks Board is borne by a very extensive area?—No, I am not.

1846. Are you aware of the jurisdiction over which the Port and Docks Board levy rates?—They levy rates at Kingstown even, and how they levy rates or for what purpose I don't know.

1847. Is there any other suggestion you wish to give the Commissioners?—I don't think there is.

Cross-examined by Dr. ANDREWS, Q.C.

1848. I think I understand you to take exception to the scavenging of the Pembroke township?—Yes.

1849. Does the General Purposes Committee over which you preside take charge of the scavenging of Dublin?—No.

1850. Then I need have no hesitation in asking you whether the state of Dublin streets is regarded with satisfaction or otherwise?—I think with the limited means at their command they are fairly and satisfactorily kept, particularly the principal streets.

1851. Do you look upon the present state of the streets as satisfactory, leaving the question of limited means out of the question?—I do look upon the present state as satisfactory.

1852. It would be a great accommodation to get rid of the scavenging material?—It would.

1853. And that you propose to deposit upon the townships?—No; I do no such thing.

1854. In what way are you to get rid of the scavenging?—There is a very large quarry up in Dumbry Brook, opposite the chapel there, from which there can be nothing pleasant, as it is full of stagnant water, and if they had some of the green stuff we take from the streets it would add to the healthfulness of the place and add to the value of the property.

1855. Then you are looking forward to this quarry as valuable for scavenging?—Yes.

1856. And you think the annexation necessary for

that accommodation?—At all events, it would greatly facilitate, for then we would have power over the area which we have not at present.

1857. You look upon a revaluation as a necessary preliminary to amalgamation?—On no other basis could amalgamation be hoped for.

1858. Have you considered on what mode you would levy the taxes? would you approve of equal taxes after a revaluation?—I would, certainly; because I believe that the incidence of taxation after revaluation would be not very much different in the townships and the city.

1859. Then you would tax anybody for a piece of ground in Penicross, Kilmainham, or Rathmines, the same as if the piece of ground was in Dame-street?—No; I would accept the present state of things, for there are exceptions at present in the townships, and they would continue. You seem to forget one thing, and it is this—that a piece of ground unbuilt upon in the townships is looked upon as agricultural ground, and it is valued accordingly for taxation purposes; but if an acre of ground becomes built upon, and produces £50 or £60 a year as ground rent, then I think it should be valued accordingly.

1860. Then take it that you have an acre of ground, and it is built upon—you think that should bear the same quantity of taxation as the same amount of land in Dame-street?—No; because it would be valued on a different scale.

1861. But the poundage rate would be the same?—Yes; it would.

1862. In the case of Clontarf you are opposed to the amalgamation?—Yes.

1863. It has no squares, a good deal of unbuilt ground, and it is not coterminous?—No.

1864. A portion of it is the property of the Corporation?—That is not the reason I gave.

1865. But it is a fact?—It is. I may say the whole of Marine is the property of the Corporation, and a large portion will fall out of lease in the course of about forty years or so. No person would take that land for the purpose of building upon it until it comes into the hands of the Corporation.

1866. Of Clontarf, the portion nearest Dublin is the property of the Corporation?—Yes.

1867. And the Corporation think it most undesirable to bring their property within the city?—Yes; because for forty years it can produce nothing.

1868. I did not hear you express any opinion about the amalgamation of Kilmainham; what is your opinion on that question?—The great question is whether it is an urban or suburban population; is it one that lives by and for the city, or does it live independently of the city, and my opinion is that it is clearly urban, living in consequence of its proximity and the advantages it has in connection with the city.

1869. And you think that Kilmainham and Clontarf are so distinct that you would clearly amalgamate the one and so clearly oppose the amalgamation of the other?—It speaks for itself—look at the map.

1870. How would you propose to deal with the question of wards?—My idea, as far as I have given the matter a cursory consideration, would be that we should have geographical lines drawn so to the existing wards, and if the outlying districts could be brought into existing wards, so much the better in the redistribution of the wards, but in the main, I would think that any of the annexed townships should be formed into self-contained, self-existing wards.

1871. In other words, you would maintain the existing wards, converting the annexed townships into separate wards?—Yes.

1872. And what would you do with regard to representation?—I would do as I before explained. My idea is that the annexed townships would form in population and in valuation, which are both very material points, about one-fourth of the whole united body; and I think they should be clearly entitled to one-fourth the representation.

1873. Are you satisfied that the existing representa-

tion of the municipal wards, as regards the qualification of the electors and so forth, form a model which you would follow in the new wards!—That opens up too extensive a question for me to give an opinion upon.

1874. That is a matter you have not considered?—Not sufficiently. The feeling of the Corporation is that all citizens, no matter what their politics, should be represented in this house. That is the universal feeling of the men here—both that population and property should be represented, and I think both should be taken as a basis.

1875. But upon what particular lines you are not able to say?—No.

1876. Dr. Norwood.—With the view of answering the Commissioners regarding the proposed representation, state now, if it is a fact, has there been any special meeting of the General Purposes Committee convened to consider the question?—I did not know, but I am so informed.

Cross-examined by Mr. Killen.

1877. You think the extension of the Public Health Act to Rathmines would be a service?—I do.

1878. But you think it would not be a service to Clontarf?—I have no doubt it would be a service to Clontarf.

1879. What is the reason then that it should not be extended?—I told you the reason. My idea is that the other townships are the natural outcome of the overflowing of the citizens of Dublin—new streets and roads, which are simply extensions with the roads and streets of Dublin; whereas the people who live in Clontarf go out to have a thoroughly suburban or rural residence.

1880. There was a remark made about there being a mile of arable ground between Amiens-bridge and the shore at the other side. I suppose you have been round in that neighbourhood?—I don't know the mile you are pointing to.

1881. Do you think there is a mile of arable land there?—I said there was about a third of a mile from the time you leave Newsmen-bridge until you come to the railway arch.

1882. As far as your recollection extends, aren't there some houses built on that piece of arable land?—Tell me the ground you are speaking of.

1883. There is a piece of ground there which I know is a piece of slab land!—That is already within the municipal boundary.

1884. No; there is part which is entirely incapable of being cultivated. I don't know whether it is in Clontarf. I believe it is about eight acres; but we will have evidence hereafter as to the whole matter. With regard to the Fire Brigade, don't you think it would be advantageous to Clontarf to have their services in case of a fire?—It would be manifestly the advantage of any place to have a Fire Brigade.

1885. Clontarf is a very dark neighbourhood at night, and there is a very small number of lamps there. Would it be an advantage, in your opinion, to have the Metropolitan Police out there?—I don't know what your knowledge of the Metropolitan Police is.

1886. Suppose the case of an unprotected female!—Well, you have a very fine force in the Royal Irish Constabulary. I would be glad to take Clontarf in; but I don't think it would be advisable.

1887. On what rational grounds is it excluded?—On the grounds you see on the map—that the proposed extension is the natural boundary; that Clontarf is a township stretched away; that there is no road flowing into it; and that there is only a fringe of houses along the shore, and once you leave it there is not a house.

1888. Clontarf is a favourite resort of the citizens of Dublin, and it would be a pity to leave it out!—It is a charming district.

1889. As a matter of fact, are you of opinion, from your knowledge of the city and of Clontarf, that the people of that district get their seal direct from Eng-

land, or elsewhere?—No; I believe they get it from the city.

1890. Then, as they are willing to share the disadvantages of being connected with the city, and of paying the additional taxes, do you think they should be refused when they ask to be brought into the city?—I have considered that question, and I think that, taking all the circumstances into account, the municipality would be better served if they were not to be included.

1891. It must only be a matter of time, and it must be included hereafter, and now that the matter is being settled don't you think it would be better to settle the whole thing at once, and then have a common Commission hereafter?—I have given you my opinion, and I am afraid I can't alter it. I know there is a long sea wall, four or five miles along that district, for which the citizens of Dublin might be called upon to keep up a staff of engineers. Then there is the question of keeping that road in repair, and there is no advantage to be gained from Clontarf; it doesn't belong to the city—it is not coterminous with the city.

1892. But the people of Clontarf get their coal and their provisions from the city, and they come in and go out and are in constant communication with the city; and, under these circumstances as they are in such intimate communication with the city for their daily necessities, why are they to be excluded?—On the principle that I look upon it as an agricultural and suburban, not an urban district.

1893. They live by the city?—Yes.

1894. And they trade in the city?—Yes.

1895. And they pay money to the city?—Yes.

1896. Clontarf is a healthy district, and likely to be built upon?—It is very likely.

1897. CHAIRMAN.—At present the population is very small?

Mr. Killen.—3,500.

CHAIRMAN.—The area is 1,395 acres, the population 3,500, and the valuation £14,517, whereas the population of Rathmines is 20,563, and the valuation £93,722.

1898. Mr. Killen.—Your objection, Alderman Harris, to Clontarf is only because it is an agricultural district?—Certainly.

1899. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it would improve Clontarf if it was brought within the metropolitan police district, and get the advantages of the metropolitan police district?—It might be a great advantage, although they are a very quiet people there.

1900. Mr. Walker, &c.—Don't you think it would be a great advantage to get in under the non-Sunday Closing law?—I suppose so. There is one very important matter which has not been referred to. The Dublin Port and Docks Board, by their recent Bill, the preamble of which has passed the House of Lords, have got power to take in a very large tract of land at the mouth of the Liffey. They have got proprietary rights or portion of it down to the point of the North Bull, and by their recent Act they have got police powers over the whole of this portion. The municipal boundary of Dublin ends at the beginning of that ground. Lately a large portion of this, which was open land, has been filled up by them. A large factory has been built, and it is deatable ground whether that factory is in the city or not, and I think the boundary should be extended to all warehouses erected on the land to be brought in. It is only so late as 1847 that the Corporation laid claim to part of it, and they did what they used to do in those good old Conservative days—they allocated it amongst themselves.

Mr. Neville.—Gosling's manure works are just on the boundary of the new ground, and they get £300 a year for that.

Mr. Killen.—The north side used to be the fashionable side.

Alderman Harris.—I am sure there is a good time coming for Clontarf.

DUBLIN.
APRIL 16, 1878.
Alderman
Harris.

DUBLIN
April 12, 1879
Alderman
Harris.

Mr. Sanderson.—I don't think it is right for this gentleman to say that Clontarf wishes for the separation.

1901. CHAIRMAN.—He says some ratepayers wish it. Mr. White, you are concerned for the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company. Are they in favour of Fingal being brought in?

Mr. White, Q.C.—Certainly not as at present advised.

CHAIRMAN.—We have it that the Railway Company pay five-sixths of their valuation in the Fingal township, and the statement of the city is that they wish to bring them in, paying only one-fourth.

Mr. White, Q.C.—That is the reason I asked Mr. Beveridge whether the Corporation had formed any plan in their own minds as to what course they propose in reference to valuation quoted railways, and they said they had not formed any proposal in their own mind, and, that being so, I am rather here to observe the evidence given, and so far as I am concerned up to the present we are quite opposed to any inde-

pendent ratepayers of the township to any incorporation of it.

Alderman Harris.—They propose to take in 850 acres of this sloping land, or one-fourth the area of Dublin, and if it be ever reclaimed it will become some of the most valuable land in the city.

1902. CHAIRMAN.—In view of that what line would you suggest, suppose Fingal was taken in? It runs down to Meath Castle and the gate. Would you propose to take a line from that across to Poober?

Alderman Harris.—They are not proposing to take any proprietary rights over this at present, but it would be a very good plan to take the whole of that in.

CHAIRMAN.—It would be a very curious boundary to take if you took any portion of that in, and that the boundary was only to go up to high water mark on the shore, and not to take in Clontarf.

Mr. Cotton.—The Corporation have not considered that question at all!

Alderman Harris.—They have; and that was one of the points they urged.

The inquiry was then adjourned.

April 12, 1879

Ms. E. D.
Gray, M.P.

DUBLIN.—FIFTH DAY.—APRIL 12TH, 1879.

Mr. E. D. Gray, M.P., examined.

1903. Mr. Haven.—Mr. Gray, have you been for some time Chairman of the Public Health Committee? —I have.

1904. Have you considered the question as to the amalgamation of the townships? —Yes, I have given a good deal of consideration to it.

1905. I believe you were examined before the Select Committee of the House of Commons in 1877! —I was, as one of the representatives of the Corporation.

1906. Have you revised the opinion you then expressed? —Yes. I gave a very decided opinion then as to the necessity for an extension of the civic boundaries, and my subsequent experience confirms that opinion and strengthens me in it.

1907. What do you consider to be the evils of the present system? —The present boundaries of Dublin are quite artificial and unnatural. The city has outgrown them. The division of authority leads to jealousies and contentions, which weaken the power of the Corporation for reform and improvement. The revenue from taxation is kept stationary. The migration of the wealthier classes outside the city boundaries, tends, owing to the necessity of constantly increasing expenditure, always called for in a modern city, to a constant increase in the taxation within the limits, and therefore every year increases the existing evil, and increases the difference between the taxation inside and outside the city, and increases the temptation for the wealthier classes—those who are able to do so—to go and live outside the civic limits.

1908. Do you consider that, practically speaking, Dublin is built upon within the municipal boundary to almost the utmost extent of the available good building ground? —Well, as regards good building ground, of course there are a good many vacant plots, but under present circumstances there is no temptation to build within the city on these plots which are not particularly eligible from not being good business sites. The difference of taxation, or at least the apparent difference of taxation, is so large, and the advantages of building outside are so considerable in many ways, that people will not build in the city. Those living in the townships are not subject to so much restraint in various ways, and they are subject to an absolutely lighter—and apparently very considerably lighter—taxation, which induces people to move outside; and even men having business premises within the city occasionally move outside into the suburbs. For instance, I remember a case that attracted my attention a little while ago very

strongly. Mr. Bolton's building yard, which that gentleman had in Richmond-street, is the case I refer to. He wished to build new concerns, and he simply moved the site of his premises across the bridge, and so escaped city taxation. There is another case—that of the distillery just outside Harold's-cross Bridge—the Greenmantle Distillery, I think it is called. When they were going to build that distillery they had it under consideration—I saw it stated in one of their reports—whether they would build the concern inside or outside the city, and in consequence of the difference of taxation, they selected a site only a stone's throw outside the city boundary. They, of course, practically belong to the city, but they escape city taxation. The great evil of this is, I think, that it tends every day to increase. It is one of those things that work in an evil circle, and as long as it is permitted to continue, so it must be expected to increase in its injurious effect. The poor will be driven into the city boundary, and become the inhabitants, as they are now to a large degree, of the old tenement houses, from which the wealthy gradually have migrated, and the rich, who are able to do so, will gradually go outside, and as this will become worse and worse day by day.

1909. Did you hear it stated in the course of this inquiry that there is not a single person resident in Dame-street, a thoroughfare in which enormous sums of money have recently been spent in the building of banks and insurance offices? —I dare say that is the fact.

1910. In view of what you have just said, it has been said and considered that people have vested interests acquired in their buildings in Rathmines and those places, do you consider that every gentleman like Mr. Bolton, or a company such as that owning the distillery to which you have referred, who go and build outside the city in the way you have stated, can be said fairly to have a vested interest—to be exempted from city taxation? —Indeed, I do not think any such thing. To think so would, in my opinion, be pure nonsense.

1911. The further they go away the more they are the city roads, and hence the greater expense as regards carriage—that is the case both in reference to Mr. Bolton and to the distillery! —The moment they go without the city it is the same. In any case they are the city, and they live by the city. I do not care if repeat evidence that has already been given so fully and fairly, but this fact is evident to any person that

knows anything of Dublin. For instance, the gentlemen who have offices in the Chamber of Commerce, and Leinster Chambers, and so on—merchants who live outside the city boundary—they all live by the city—they would not be here at all but for the city—and yet they escape their legitimate share of the burden of the city, and what I consider very much worse, they escape their legitimate share of the responsibility, and they cease to have an active personal interest in the well-governing of the city, which I consider far more important than to get their fair contribution to its taxation.

1913. In reference to the question of the public health, have you considered the question of the crowding of families into these tenement houses?—I have. I believe it is a great cause of the high death-rate of Dublin that the poorer classes are housed in dwellings quite unsuited for them, and which were never built in contemplation of being occupied as tenement houses with large numbers of families in them. Those houses, of which there is a large number, unfortunately, on the north side of the city, are all turned into tenement houses. They were occupied by the wealthier classes years ago, and except something can be done to improve the dwellings of the poorer classes in Dublin, I believe that we never can reduce the death-rate to a satisfactory point.

1913. What steps are the Corporation taking at present in reference to artisans' dwellings?—The Corporation at my initiation some time ago introduced a small scheme for building artisans' dwellings which they are now carrying out by clearing an area in the Coombe. We have obtained power to borrow £20,000 for the purpose; and we have taken up £12,000 or £13,000 of that sum. I am not sure which is the exact amount we have already got. The Act, however, is not only a difficult one to put into operation, but it is an excessively costly one, and if it is ever to be put into operation in Dublin on a really extensive scale, I think we shall have to require the contributions of those who are really interested in such a reform, and I consider that the townships are as much interested in it as the city.

1914. In the first place, the townships have been built by the artisans and tradesmen of Dublin?—Yes; and the tradesmen also who attend to their daily wants reside in the city—the plumbers who repair their pipes, the painters who paint their houses—all those people live in the city; they must live in the city; they must live close to, or within a reasonable distance of, the establishments of their employers, and the better class of artisans are as much employed outside the city as they are within it.

1915. As regards the new and prosperous townships, there is a great deal of transient work done daily around and within them?—There is an enormous amount of work done daily by the men resident in those tenement houses in the city I have already spoken of. There is an enormous amount of work done by those men in the townships. No matter what the governing body of each township was that would be inevitable, because, as I add before, those men must reside near their employers' premises, and the tendency to this state of things is increased by the heads of the townships making stringent conditions as to the letting of their lands for building. I do not think they are inclined, as a rule, to encourage the erection of houses for the working classes.

1916. You used an expression as regards the Chamber of Commerce and the Leinster Chambers, I believe, to the effect that every single gentleman having offices in those buildings lives outside of the city?—Well, I should think they do, almost every one.

1917. Have you given any consideration to the subject of the terms of amalgamation, supposing it were carried out?—I have; but I do not attach very much importance to the terms of amalgamation. I should adopt one of two rules. I take it with regard to the financial question, that is to say, I would let the existing areas bear their respective present debts, and

have common funds for future expenditure, or I would merge the entire of the funds in one. Now, I really don't think that whichever alternative he adopted, there can be much difference, and in relation to precedents, I may say that both courses have been adopted; so that as you have no fixed rule to go by, I don't think it makes any importance. I think, of course, that you should have a uniform valuation prior to any change such as this, because the valuation at present is unequal. The valuation of the townships is of a higher average—considerably higher than the valuation of the city; and, therefore, the poundage rate is apparently lower than it is in reality. But if you had a uniform valuation, taking into consideration the large amount of property which we possess—principally civic estate—which is worth something between £600,000 and £800,000—£700,000 probably—taking that into consideration when you have a re-valuation, I do not think it would make much difference which plan were adopted. For my own part I think the advantages of either plan would be so enormous that I would not mind very much which were taken.

1918. Now, the present rate of the Pembroke township, I believe, is about 3d. 3d. in the pound, and they will have a main drainage debt of £10,000 or £12,000, which they will have to pay the interest on?—Yes.

1919. And the rate to pay that will be from 1s. 7d. to 1s. 9d. 3d.—It will be about 1s. 7d., I believe. I believe it has been made out to be about that.

1920. If so, Pembroke, when the main drainage rate is being paid, will have a higher rate of taxation than 4s. 6d., which is the amount of the present municipal rates of Dublin?—It will. Of course, you know against that amount we, sometimes or other, will have to carry out a main drainage scheme, which is one of the essentials, I think, for the proper administration of the city.

1921. Something was said during the progress of this inquiry about the abandonment of the Main Drainage Bill which was carried for Dublin; can you give any explanation of why that fell through?—It was very violently opposed. You see whenever this Corporation proposes any large scheme, there starts up an amount of opposition to it which very frequently paralyses, to a considerable extent, the power of the Corporation. The Chamber of Commerce and amateur bodies which call themselves Citizens' Committees and so on, start up and represent themselves as being the citizens of Dublin, and say that the Corporation does not sufficiently represent the citizens, to be justified in carrying out such schemes. This section is an influential section, as regards the social standing and position of its members; and there was a very violent opposition to the main drainage scheme which, though not successful in preventing the passing of the Bill, was successful to the extent of rather tending to allay the feeling in its favour. However, it was contemplated to be carried out, but at the time that the contracts were advertised for, it was at a period when coal, iron, and labour were at enormous prices. The tenders very much exceeded the estimates—indeed, I think almost doubled them. The Corporation did not feel themselves financially justified in accepting any of these tenders, and then the scheme was dropped. They subsequently counterbalanced its removal and made application for a loan of, I think, £300,000, which, on some plea that I never could understand, was declined by the Treasury, and they would not grant us the money.

1922. Don't you consider it one of the advantages of amalgamation, that all those different interests would be represented in one united body under the Corporation?—That is the real advantage of it. The advantage in the way of the relief of taxation would be very much smaller than men imagine. The real advantage would be the getting of a strong and united administration of a district whose interests are identical, and whose inhabitants should work together for the common good. That you have not got at present, but you have got jealousies and impediments of

DEBATES.
April 12, 1917
Ms. E. D.
Gray, m.n.

DUBLIN,
April 12, 1873.
Ms. E. D.
Gray, M.P.

all kinds which this reform would sweep away, and that, I believe, would be the real advantage of it. 1923. In reference to the terms of amalgamation, have there been any complaints as regards the present arrangement of the fifteen wards of the city, or are they supposed to be satisfactorily arranged?—I am not aware of any complaints. I have heard the division criticised, and I have heard it said that political motives entered into that division. I am not aware of any complaints, nor is it likely that any complaint would arise. There would be no reason for it. We have anomalies of this kind in every representation—Parliamentary and otherwise. We have not advanced to the stage of equal electoral districts yet, and, probably, we are a long way from it. The interests of the wards are identical. Men in this council do not come in to represent one ward or another. They really forget once they enter upon their duties, personally, what ward they represent; or whether they come from a ward having a small valuation and a large population; or from one having a large valuation and a small population. That is not considered at all, because there is no diversity of interest at all.

1924. Supposing the fifteen wards were left as they are, with the exception of putting Kilmainham into the nearest ward to it, which would, I believe, be Aran-quay Ward, the new districts of Pembroke and Rathmines, of course, on being amalgamated with the city of Dublin, ought to have each representation. They ought to have proportionate representation.

1925. I mean that that would of course be necessary. A plan was proposed during this inquiry of taking one town councillor from each of the present fifteen wards, and in that way give fifteen representatives to the new amalgamated districts. Would you approve of that arrangement?—Yes; I think that would be probably unobjectionable. After the passage of the Dublin Improvement Act of 1849, I think a Commission was appointed for the purpose of re-adjusting the wards, and the probability is that the outcome of this investigation—if the Commissioners report in favour of amalgamation—would be the appointment of a subsequent commission to reorganise the wards; but I think the proposal to give Rathmines and Pembroke two or three wards each, or three for one of them and two for the other, would be a satisfactory arrangement, and probably the Rathmines and Pembroke people would like better to be distinctly represented by members selected by the ratepayers in their own areas.

1926. If there were two wards for Rathmines, and two for Pembroke, and one for Drumcondra, how do you think such an arrangement as that would work?—That would be the simplest way, and I would be inclined to take the simplest, because I do not attach any importance to the matter at all. I would take the easiest way, for once you have the interests identical, and coming under one single governing body, the representatives would really cease to remember whether they belonged to Rathmines, Pembroke, or Aran-quay.

1927. CHAIRMAN.—I don't know whether you are aware of the fact, Mr. Gray, or not, but we are empowered to inquire as to the adjustment of the wards in the city?—I am; but I forgot it at the time I gave my answer with reference to that.

1928. Of course, we must recommend what is to be done with regard to anything that is to be added to the present area of the city, in case we do recommend an increase of area. That is the reason why I called attention to it the other day, in order that we might have the opinions of all parties concerned with regard to that!—My opinion is, that perhaps the most theoretically perfect, and perhaps the most convenient and the readiest change, would be to give to Rathmines, Pembroke, and that northern district—if it was not to be taken into one of the existing wards—to divide them into wards, and give them proportionate representation—say to give Rathmines three wards, and Pembroke two.

1929. Supposing we have only fifteen representatives to be taken from the present city, there could be only five new wards—that is, giving an alderman and two town councillors to each ward!—If you gave Rathmines three and Pembroke two, and took Kilmainham into the adjoining ward in the city, I think that that would be a simple and satisfactory way of dealing with the matter.

Mr. HERON.—But then there is Drumcondra!

1930. CHAIRMAN.—Alderman Harris or Mr. Dawson was for keeping the number of representatives at sixty, as at present, and having regard to the fact that Dublin is valued at £600,000, and the townships at £200,000, would not an arrangement giving one-fourth of the representation to those individual districts, and the remaining three-fourths to the city, as at present, be a satisfactory and equitable one? Would that meet your view?—I think so; I think that would do very well.

1931. That would be giving representation to valuation and population both!—I think that would do excellently.

1932. MR. HERON.—Or, if there is any difficulty about the northern district, to increase the number of members by three!—Yes.

1933. CHAIRMAN.—How would you propose to divide the fifteen members of the Corporation among the newly added districts, supposing the fifteen members were to be given to those districts?—I think the best thing would be to try and ascertain the views of all parties in relation to the suggested representation, in the proportion of one-fourth for the townships, and three-fourths for the city; and then we could see afterwards how the members could be allocated.

Mr. HERON.—If there was a re-valuation the city would go up £350,000.

1934. CHAIRMAN.—Perhaps the townships would go up in proportion?

Mr. HERON.—Scarcely in proportion.

According to Mr. Stokes's view, as stated before the Select Committee, the valuation of Rathmines was one-third, and that of Dublin was one-half, under the real valuation. That bears out the valuation I mentioned of the houses, which I said would bring in Dublin up to £900,000, and the outlying townships to £300,000.

Examination resumed.

1935. CHAIRMAN.—Bearing that in mind, would you still have the proportions of the representation kept at one-fourth and three-fourths?—*Adpropos* of a re-valuation—taking a low valuation of the city, if it bears a uniform relation in the main, it is no great harm; but I have been, unfortunately, led to think that it does not bear any such relation, for the poorer localities have not been re-valued, though they have decreased in letting value considerably, and they are overtaxed at this moment in proportion to the wealthier localities.

1936. Of course it would not be fair, as you say, supposing there was a recommendation to bring in these townships, to bring them in on the present reduced valuation, because then the townships would be paying more than their proportion; but if Dublin and the townships are respectively re-valued on their true valuation, then each would be paying the rates in its fair proportion and on the same scale!—No doubt; and I think if that was done, the difference or increase that would be put on the townships would be but a nominal one; I think it would be, but a very small thing, indeed.

1937. In that view, Mr. Gray, what would your idea be with regard to the existing debts of these associations and of Dublin? In England, as I understand, there has not been any uniform rule on the subject. Would it be your view that Dublin should remain liable to its present debts, and the townships to them, and that all future debts should be charged on the entire new municipality; or, having regard to the

debt now due by each, would you make the new municipality subject to all present debts, and give the townships the benefit of the city estate and the sinking fund for paying off present debts?—I would bring them in at once, because my object at the earliest possible moment would be to have one homogeneous body. I think if it was submitted to actual calculation to estimate the future value of our estate and the difference between our debts and rates for waterworks and theirs, ours being extinguishable after about thirty years, and theirs, the water charges, being in perpetuity—if all these matters were taken into consideration, and that it was known that when we would have our water for nothing, they must continue to pay us for it, I think it would be found that they would make a very good bargain by bulkling the whole thing at once.

1938. Besides after the heavy debt of £50,000 is paid off, which it may be in a few years by the payment of the annual instalments, the Improvement rate will be lessened by the amount of interest that has to be charged upon and paid out of it!—That is so. We contemplate raising £100,000 now—in fact, we have sent in the application for it. That £100,000 is for paving, and I think that is an improvement in the cost of which they should bear their share, for it is practically a new work, and one that will be as much for their benefit as ours.

1939. Mr. Heron.—Is not the proper paving of the streets one of the most important sanitary measures that could be carried out?—Yes; owing to the still unsatisfactory state of Dublin in relation to paving, scavenging, and so on, the present condition of the streets of Dublin must remain unsatisfactory until paving is carried out almost universally, and I believe it is now the determination of the Corporation to pave the entire city, except such districts as perhaps the Circular-road, where there is not much traffic, but the denser portions of the city will be paved by the Corporation as fast as the works can be done.

1940. Is the Circular-road still under joint management?—I am not very clear as to that. I cannot say.

Mr. Reesidey.—It is altogether under the city.

1941. Mr. CORCORAN.—It is only the Baggott-road that is under divided management?—The Baggott-road is divided in some extraordinary way.

1942. CHAIRMAN.—Are not the roads in the city greatly cut up from day to day by the cartage to and from the townships?—Yes.

1943. Mr. Heron.—Does not the great coal cartage out there injure the roadways, at all events?—Yes, of course. All their trade is carried on in that way through our streets, for which they contribute nothing. A suggestion has, I believe, been made that the difficulty about the streets might be met by a contributory rate. Now I wish to say that that in my opinion would be merely avoiding the question.

1944. CHAIRMAN.—I don't know whether your last remark may have been elicited from something I said. What I said was this—Having the enactment sanctioned by the Legislature before putting the whole of the metropolitan district, Clontarf, and a portion of Drumcondra in a common area for payment of a common bridge tax for the bridges of Dublin, the Legislature must have deemed it fair to make all within that district pay for the keeping up of those bridges. I then said, suppose the townships were left as they are, might it not be fair to make all the district subject to the bridge tax liable to contribute some small rate to the support of the roads leading through the city to those bridges?—There is no reason why they should not repair the approaches to as well as the bridges.

1945. Is there not an analogy in the Baggott-road as an approach to the city?—Certainly, something of that kind would be perfectly just and reasonable. I was under the impression that the suggestion was to avoid amalgamation by means of a contributory rate—that in that way the finances of the city might be relieved. Well, although that might relieve the fineness of the

city to a certain extent, it would not attain the really important object—that of a united administration, and, instead, it would be a source of endless disputes and jealousies.

1946. Mr. CORCORAN.—And perhaps of irritation?—And irritation.

1947. Mr. Heron.—If there was a subsidiary rate from the townships, would not that afford you some return for the advantages gained by the townships?—It might afford some return, but in my opinion it would only be a means of extending the jealousies and want of co-operation which at present figure both parties.

1948. They would say that the Corporation got these rates for the streets, and that they were applying them to something else?—We would have endless contentions.

1949. Have you considered the subsequent saving by the paving of Dublin, have you made any calculation?—Calculations have been made; there would, I think, be an ultimate saving, and a very considerable saving. There would be an enormous improvement, and there would be something of a financial saving. That is to say, that the paving could be carried out with a small financial saving on the charge. The scavenging cost would be largely diminished, and against that you must put the interest and the sinking fund.

1950. Do you consider that the Municipal boundary of the city should also be the Parliamentary boundary?—I do not care to consider the two questions together. I do not see that they have any relation the one with the other, and I think it complicates the question to introduce the question of the Parliamentary boundary. The probability is, that if the civic boundary were made as satisfactory and a real one, the Parliamentary boundary might be made correspond with it. I do not, however, think that the two changes necessarily are connected, and I would rather not consider the political question and the Parliamentary question in connexion with the question of municipal boundaries. That refers will come, probably.

1951. Do you wish to make any further suggestion, Mr. Gray?—I do not think so.

1952. Have you considered the question of juries?—Yes. No doubt there would be a considerable convenience in that respect. An influential body called the Dublin Juries' Association has been formed in this city for the purpose of seeking to relieve juries from some of the inconveniences under which they at present labour. I believe that if a sufficient area were given to the city, and care taken to properly divide the city and the county juries, the same men would not be summoned both as county and city juries for the same day. This happens at present in many cases, and makes the system so unpopular. When you have a venue so large as the county Dublin you might have a proper municipal area for the venue in the city of Dublin, which would be more popular in many cases. There is the table here which I took the trouble to make out, to show you how many of our reforms have been opposed by the Chamber of Commerce as representing the city of Dublin. For instance, the Chamber of Commerce was very active in opposing the Vauxhall water scheme, and the Parliamentary costs of that scheme totalled up to over £50,000, something like £25,000, probably caused by the opposition of a small though influential section of gentlemen, who, owing to their residing outside the city, consider that they are not part of the city, and that they are not bound to take any personal care in looking after civic affairs, and they merely find it convenient to indulge in ungracious criticism. In the same way the Gas Bill was opposed, and successfully opposed—a Bill which would have given the Corporation as much as £20,000 a year civic revenue if it had been passed. I took up the names of the Council of the Chamber of Commerce—I do not mean to say that those gentlemen are responsible for say of those oppositions, but they have now the power to promote and oppose bills, and

DUBLIN,
April 12, 1879.
Mr. E. D.
Gray, M.P.

DEBATES
April 22, 1875.
Mr. E. D.
Gray, M.P.

If we presented a Bill to-morrow, and they opposed it, they would oppose it in the name of the city of Dublin—¹⁵ We, the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Dublin, and so on. Well, I find now that, with the exception of Mr. Joseph Boyce (who is since dead), Mr. John Janssen, Mr. J. E. Barry, Mr. Richard Martin, and Mr. Patrick Sweetman, whose address is given as at 23, Francis-street, all the other members of the Council—about 25—reside outside the city; and if we presented an Improvement Bill, or otherwise measure, and they opposed it, they would come forward and oppose it as representing the city of Dublin.

1953. CHAIRMAN.—Have they not all the advantages of such measures?—Yes, they have, and yet they oppose them, though their personal interest is entirely outside the city. If a man has an office in Dublin, and lives in the country, he has very different views of sanitary reform to those he would possess if he resided wholly in the city. Though those men occupy a great many offices, they may be very small rated; so that really some of these gentlemen have no interest in the city at all, and it is probable, if the matter was investigated more carefully than I have time to investigate it, you would find that none of them reside in the city of Dublin.

1954. Mr. Corcoran.—Have you considered the question of taking in Clontarf?—Well, I don't think it would be desirable to take in Clontarf.

1955. Why do you think that Clontarf stands in a different position from the other townships?—It is very much isolated, it is a kind of peninsula, and separated from the city by Marino, and it is more an agricultural district a good deal than any of the others. You see the dotted red line put on the map—that shows the section of the foreshore, called the Wet Lots, which the Port and Docks Board have obtained proprietary rights over by the passing of the Bill. I would like to take in all that, because eventually docks and warehouses might be built on it, and that is in contemplation.

1956. Would you contemplate taking in the land as far as the Poolbeg Lighthouse?—I would not. If we took in that dotted section I think it would be quite enough.

1957. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think it desirable that the Corporation should have some control over all that space of ground between the Poolbeg Lighthouse and the end of the Pembroke township on the South side; and again, I find, looking at this map, that the Lighthouse at the other side of the river, and the Graving Dock, are not proposed to be taken in, and do not come within that line. Don't you think, opposing the Pembroke township was taken in, that it would be more desirable to draw a straight line from the south-eastern end of the Pembroke township to the Poolbeg Lighthouse, and then have Clontarf taken in—that is, to take in at all events the portion taken in by the Port and Docks Board?—Yes.

1958. Mr. Waller.—Do you think that any portion of that is the property of the Crown—I mean that between high and low water marks?

1959. CHAIRMAN.—Surely they could settle that with the Crown afterwards?—I think such a scheme would be more perfect, and it would avoid difficulties hereafter.

Mr. Gray.—In most of the small towns under the Towns Improvement Act which we have visited up to the present, there appears to be a concord of opinion, that a district varying from one-and-a-half to two miles from the centre of the town derives exceptional value from its proximity to the town as a market town—the poorer classes of people who occupy the land in the vicinity of the town having the benefit of its market for the sale of their produce; and on the other hand, the gentry having great advantages from their proximity to the town, and many its schools, places of worship, banks, and shops. If that would apply to small towns, would you not say that it would apply more strongly to Dublin, and that there should be an extension of the boundaries of Dublin, even of a more ex-

tensive character than the area now suggested to be taken in?—If you go out to Milltown and Dundrum, those districts are all studded with gentlemen's seats—the residences of people who draw all their supplies from Dublin, and who use the roads of Dublin just as much, and more perhaps, than the people of Rathmines. Don't you think it would be fairer to take a line dealing with townland boundaries, roads, or other well-defined bounds extending from Dublin to, say, a two-mile radius, from the centre of Dublin? I would like to know your view with regard to that, because if there is to be a general rate applied we should be glad to get all the information possible on the point. In almost every place we have been where an extension has been sought some have gone in for a three-mile area, some for one of one-and-a-half or two miles, but the average appears to be one of two miles from the centre of the town; and then that the rating on that district should be divided between the owner and occupier of the land and houses, as they are both made more valuable because of their proximity to the town, and we should be glad to have your views on these points!—Yes. Well, of course, that question of the division of the rates is a very wide and difficult one. I think our suggestion of taking in the townships was simply that we found these areas already formed, but I myself rather like the size you have suggested.

1960. Suppose we were considering the case of Rathmines and Pembroke alone, and that Dublin was not adjoining them, would it not be naturally used?—“You ought to increase Rathmines in the same way as you would increase any of the smaller towns.” The Rathmines people might say, “We want to have our township extended to a distance of two miles from the centre of the township, because the people in that district use the roads of our municipality, and therefore they should pay something towards the cost of their maintenance.” If we did that with regard to Rathmines and Pembroke, if they were isolated townships, must not we consider the matter if they are to be brought into the city, and that we are dealing with the city plus the municipalities; what is your view in reference to that, and would you bring in the district I have suggested as an adjunct to the whole?—I think that is a serious consideration, and I am not prepared off-hand to give a decided opinion upon it. Under the recent sanitary legislation there are heavy obligations imposed upon urban sanitary authorities, and to take in districts composed of purely agricultural land, might involve the sanitary authorities in difficulties, owing to their bearing portions of the urban district if they were so brought in.

1961. But can it be said that the portion of the area between Dundrum and Dublin, and Stillorgan and Dublin, is an agricultural district—properly so called; is it not occupied by gentlemen's seats, or the land let for grazing purposes, for which enormous rents are obtained?—I believe as much as ten guineas an acre is obtained from dairymen for the summer six months of the year on account of the proximity of that land to the city. Everywhere of these people use the roads of Dublin and those of the townships to their extreme ends. On what principle is it, if these lands and gentlemen's seats were within a mile or two of one of the small municipal towns, they ought to be brought in from their proximity to the town, that they should not be brought within the radius of Rathmines, or Pembroke, or Dublin?—I would rather judge each locality on its merits, and make an irregular boundary which would really take in all the suburbs, and nothing but the suburbs in each particular case, than make a symmetrical boundary that would take in too much agricultural land.

1962. Don't let it be imposed from anything I have said that we have come to any decision with regard to the boundary of any single town. We are distinct, before coming to any conclusion, to hear the evidence on the subject as a whole. But in most of the places we have been, the opinion has been as I have stated!—It should be remembered that by the Public Health

Act of last year the local authorities and the urban authorities can now obtain, without the sanction or veto of the Grand Jury, an extension of their limits, and that relieves us of a great deal of difficulty. If such a provision had not existed it might be desirable now to extend the municipal boundaries, with a view to including future extensions of the suburb proper; that is to provide for the future a few years ahead; but now we have that, and if anything in the shape of a suburb sprang up within new limits we could apply to have it included, and could have it included in a ready and convenient form. I would like to have the limits confined to what are really the existing suburbs.

1943. Mr. Corrigan.—That clause has not been acted on, I think, in any case. It is not a matter of course?—Oh, yes, by way of Provisional Order.

1943. But the Local Government Board have to consider it, and make a provisional order, and that order may be opposed in Parliament?—Yes.

1944. So that it does not follow, as a matter of course?—No, it does not follow as a matter of course. I do not think that the clause has as yet been acted upon.

1945. There have been some applications for it, I think?—I think in Bellins it has been contemplated.

1946. And in Tralee?—Yes.

1947. CHAIRMAN.—Does it not appear strange that no contribution is made to the city for the use of the roads by the military stationed in Portobello and Richmond Barracks. We all know that the artillery and cavalry use Portobello Barracks, and the entire of the supplies to that barracks are carried over the Dublin streets, and anything that the Crown gives goes to the Rathmines township, and not a farthing to the city of Dublin?—Quite so.

1948. With reference to our extended warrant, by which we are to enquire into the incidence of taxation, would you have any objection to give as your views with regard to the division of the rates between landlords and tenants. You are aware that under the Public Health Act of last year as regards the rate levied by the rural sanitary authority, the tenant deducts half from his landlord. Would you think that that principle should be applied to all the rates levied by the urban sanitary authority, or would you only confine it to the poor rate and sanitary rate within the urban sanitary authority?—A great many considerations enter into that question. No doubt, it is most anomalous at present, that in an urban district the rate should be levied exclusively off the occupier, and that in a rural district it should be levied half off the occupier and half off the landlord; but I do not think it makes any difference in the long run, on whom it is levied—it is like the tax on tea—it comes on the consumer in any case. Of course, any change in the incidence of such a tax as that works a certain amount of injustice, because you have existing leases and existing arrangements, which cannot be modified to meet the altered circumstances. Men have made their contracts to meet the existing arrangements, and when the latter are changed it throws matters out of gear for a certain time, but when they have settled down to their nominal condition, it really makes no matter whether the incidence of the rate is changed or not. If you tax a landlord £10 that he has hitherto paid, and relieve the tenant of that amount that he has hitherto paid, the landlord adds the £10 to his rent, and the thing comes to be as broad as it is long. I am quite aware that occupiers—especially those who have not considered the question—take a different view and imagine that they would be relieved of the tax, and in that way an inducement is held out to them which I think they would be foolish to accept. I prefer leaving matters as they are. I do not see that any change in the nominal incidence of the tax will change the real incidence of it. I fail to see any advantage to be obtained from it, compared with the disadvantages that I see in various ways.

1949. But don't you see that in the case of the rural sanitary authorities the Legislature have stepped in and

interfered with the existing rates, and why should it not be done in the face of the urban sanitary authority dealing with similar rates?—Then you come to the political question. It was changed with the view of protecting the present mode of election of Poor Law Guardians. Now I think it would be a lamentable thing to see the present mode of election of Poor Law Guardians made applicable to the election of the civic representatives, and I think the proposal to alter the incidence of the tax is made with the idea of thereby establishing an argument for the direct representation of owners and gas owners. I think that is the real motive.

1950. I am anxious of knowing your views with regard to the sanitary rate and the poor rate. The Legislature appear to be legislating for the sanitary rate in the same way as they legislated for the poor rate—that the owner and occupier should each pay half?—Not by the Act of last session, because the poor rate was so before that time. I think that always the sanitary expenditure was payable out of the same rate as the other expenses of the body which had the administration of the funds—in the rural districts it was the Boards of Guardians, and in the urban districts it was the Corporations, and so on. I am not aware that any change was made by either the Act of 1874 or the Act of 1878.

1951. It is only in recent years the change has been made. It was lately decided in the Court of Exchequer in this country. The decision was, that the tenant could deduct half of the sanitary rate from his landlord the same as the poor rate. Do you think that the law should be the same in the urban sanitary authority so far as the sanitary rate is concerned?—I would not change it at all, although I am aware there is a strong feeling in favour of such a change.

1952. Do you, however, think the change undesirable?—I think the alteration of the individual who paid the tax would not affect the incidence of it. Whoever paid in the first case, it would fall on the same shoulders eventually.

1953. From your knowledge of the Corporation, suppose the coterminating districts proposed by the Corporation were recommended by us to be annexed, is it your opinion that the present number of the Corporation could do the business of the enlarged area?—No doubt it could with a reduced garrison; and I think an increase of the number would make the work more cumbersome. I think that sixty is a convenient number for working the civic administration. I do not think that increasing the number of our body would increase our facility for doing business. My experience is that two good men can do more work than three, and three than four.

1954. Then I understand, Mr. Grey, that what you are favourable to is, that suppose we recommend the annexation sought, the added district should not be brought in on any principle of differential rating; but that whatever is recommended to be brought in—if there is any so recommended—should be brought in and made part of the same one and undivided body?—That is my view, because I think, financially, the difference would be so slight that it would not be worth considering. I would not object to either system, because I do not think it would make much difference.

1955. And even if they might pay a higher rate than they do at present—that with the wiping out of the water rate and the money borrowed for paving and getting the benefit of the large city—probably in a few years they would not be paying more than they are at present?—I think so; they might pay a little more for a few years, but eventually they would be relieved.

Cross-examined by Mr. Walker.

1956. You know the calculations of the excise and the calculations of the loans allocated in these townships are different to what they are at present?—I believe they are.

1957. What is your view about the representation of property and population. Which do you consider

DUBLIN,
April 21, 1878.
Mr. H. D.
Grey, M.P.

Dissent.
April 13, 1879.
Mr. E. D.
Gray, M.P.

desirable. What is your view—I object to the representation of property altogether.

1978. Mr. Heron.—That is by property solely?—Yes, by property solely.

1979. Mr. Walker.—What is your view about the representation?—My view as to the representation is a very simple one. I would nominate the representation to the English municipal representation. I would have a uniform law for the three Kingdoms.

1980. But what would that amount to?—That is practically household inference.

1981. What are the exact reasons why you would not include Clontarf within the municipal area. You have stated one—as to its being an agricultural district. That was one of the two, I think, you said. What was the other reason; or to put it in another way, what difference is there in the principle that you have been laying down as to making the other townships desirable objects for annexation. What is the difference in the principles so far as Clontarf is concerned, that it should not be included?—Clontarf comes within a principle which I attempted to lay down that it was undesirable to include agricultural areas within an urban district. I regard it as being very much more of an agricultural area than any of the places already named. It is cut off from the city considerably, and does not form naturally or geographically a portion of it.

1982. But don't the people of Clontarf use the roads of the city?—Well, every man in the county Dublin who drives into the city of Dublin uses the roads. It is purely a question of degree, but the fixed population is very much less in a place that is in fact a more rural district.

1983. Don't the artisans of Dublin build the houses there?—Such houses as there are, but they are very few. The artisans of Dublin build every house in the county—every good house.

1984. The fact is, that the House of Lords has not given you any powers over that piece of land described on the map!—They have not interfered with our powers beyond giving to the Port and Docks Board compulsory powers of purchase. We simply wanted to have our rights, whatever they were, preserved. We claimed proprietary rights, but in the recent investigation before the House of Lords they did not go into the question of who owned the lands. They gave to the Port and Docks Board compulsory powers of purchase, just as they would give them over your property or mine if the Board could establish a good case.

1985. Have you considered the question as to the difference in the quantity of buildings in Drumcondra and Clontarf townships, and are you not aware that two-thirds of the Drumcondra township is not built on?—I don't know the locality very well, but I know there is a good deal of building going on there at present.

1986. That is since the Township Act was passed last year?—Yes; within the last three or four years, I think, a great deal of building has been done there. I think Mr. Lombard and Mr. McMahon have been building extensively there.

1987. That is since the Township Act passed?—I am not personally aware, but I was under the impression that there was a good deal of building going on before that.

1988. Are you aware that two-thirds of Drumcondra is still unbuilt on?—I am not personally aware of that.

1989. Could you state what is the gross amount of the unbuilt on land of Dublin—land that is within the present unmarked boundary?—I could not. It would be very easy to have such a return prepared for you if you desired it, but I could not tell you.

Cross-examined by Mr. Killen.

1990. On the part of some Clontarf ratepayers, who are anxious that their township should be annexed to the city, I wish to ask you a few questions, Mr. Gray.

You said that Clontarf was an agricultural district altogether—I did not. I said it was a question of degree, but Clontarf is more an agricultural district than the other townships which it is considered desirable to bring in.

1991. With proper encouragement, don't you think that Clontarf could become like Rathmines or Fenian's, and have a large amount of buildings?—The land is there, and no doubt it could be built on if there were people who would build on it.

1992. Are you not aware that there has been a considerable amount of building going on there for some time?—Well, I thought that Clontarf was going down. I do not think that, proportionately, much building has been going on there.

1993. If, as a matter of fact, there has been a number of houses built lately, and that building is still going on, is there no sign of its going down?—No doubt.

1994. Don't you think Clontarf derives advantages from its proximity to the city?—Yes, a great many people used to go out there on Sundays.

1995. Do you think that if Clontarf had all the advantages in the way of paving, proper drainage, and so forth, it would still further increase in prosperity?—I do, certainly. I think if it was properly paved and properly drained it would be more prosperous.

1996. I do not see, as far as the geographical connexion between Clontarf and the city is concerned, how much it is severed from the city more than Rathmines. There is a piece of arable land, described as scrub land, connecting Amiensbridge with the shore, and beyond this piece a piece of mere slob land, which has been built upon. Supposing the rest of this piece of slob land was built upon—as a matter of fact there are four or five houses built upon it already—would it not seem that there would not be any disseminating point at all between the city or Clontarf?—Yes; but when that is likely to occur we could use those powers which I have mentioned—we could apply to the Local Government Board for a provisional order and take you in.

1997. But such a course as that would incur additional expense?—No; the expense of the provisional order is very small.

1998. Don't you think that—now we are defining boundaries—Clontarf being part of the city, and a very historical appanage of the city—don't you think it would be of advantage to the people of Clontarf if they were amalgamated with the city?—That is a point of view that I have failed up to this to consider, and, of course, it has its importance. The fact of the battle of Clontarf having here fought there ought to have its proper weight, and you can attach what weight you please to my observations.

1999. The people of Clontarf want to be absorbed in fact, and if they are willing to incur the additional encumbrance or taxation imposed upon them by the city, don't you think it would be reasonable to take them in?—That is just the question—whether the advantages to the city would be proportionate. However, the question of the annexation of Clontarf was submitted to a committee of the Corporation, who gave it very careful consideration, and I am inclined to agree with them that the advantages would not be proportionate.

2000. Of course, I know that the city is very benevolent, and I know that I take into consideration the benefits accruing to the outlying parties, and if the Clontarf township would be benefited to even a greater degree than the city, and is willing to incur an additional amount of taxation for the purpose of being connected with it, don't you think, as a mere matter of pure philanthropy—to put it on a very low ground—that the city should take in Clontarf?—Well, now, I think that the purely philanthropic view is a very high ground, but the ground we must look to is from the utilitarian point of view. I can only repeat it is a question of degree. Clontarf has claims certainly to be considered, and there are also certain objections to

these claims. I do not think there is any positive objection to taking that township in.

2001. There are many persons who do business in Dublin and who live there—Yes; if you take the sea shore, there is a considerable suburban population.

2002. You know also that nearly all the goods that are obtained by the people of Clontarf for their daily subsistence are procured in the city of Dublin—No doubt.

2003. There are no stores out there—No considerable stores.

2004. None of any consequence!—Quite so.

2005. These people are financially as a matter of fact in the city; they are using the roads going into the city constantly!—They are, no doubt.

2006. Now as they are willing enough to have connection with the city, don't you think if they are willing to undertake the additional taxes they should be brought in!—I cannot say I think so, because I have already said I don't think so.

2007. Is there any substantial reason against the people of Clontarf—I can only allege the reason which I have already stated—you must draw the line somewhere. All your arguments would equally apply to a district outside Clontarf. There is no principal on which the line of demarcation can be arbitrarily fixed. I think that on the whole the balance of evidence would be in favour of not including Clontarf. On the other hand, I would not see any objection to including it if it were so recommended.

2008. Now supposing we could show that by the connection of Clontarf with the city, the people out in Clontarf would have better protection as to the police and from fire, better drainage, and so on, don't you think those would be good reasons for such annexation!—You could have the Metropolitan Police District extended to Clontarf without any interference with the municipal boundaries.

2009. Now supposing a poor person gets sick out there—a person unable to pay for a doctor—where does he or she go for relief!—Well, I suppose such a person should go into one of the Dublin hospitals.

2010. And does not that oblige the city to incur additional expense!—No doubt.

2011. If that case, and as the people of Clontarf are obliged to go into the city and impose upon the city additional expense in the matter of their sick, don't you think it a matter worthy of consideration that the people of Clontarf should be obliged to pay something for the maintenance of the city hospitals!—I think they might, but you seem rather to argue the other way—that the advantage would be for Clontarf,

and that being so, I cannot see that the fact of using our hospitals gives them a claim to ask us to contribute towards the maintenance of their roads or drains.

2012. Yes; I think it does, and for this reason—if the drainage of Clontarf is not good, the people are more liable there to sickness, and being more liable to sickness than if the drainage was proper and effective they go into Dublin oftener than they otherwise would. The worse the drainage of Clontarf, the greater the sickness, and the more the expense caused by the people of that place using the Dublin hospitals, and as a matter of fact they are naturally connected with the Dublin hospitals. The drainage of Clontarf is very bad, and the sickness is more frequent in consequence of that!—No doubt; the drainage must be bad because it is so low lying.

2013. Your principal reason for not including Clontarf is because it is an agricultural district mainly!—Quite so; but, as I have already said, I am not at all wedded to the idea of the exclusion of Clontarf.

Mr. Sender—*I would like to get the names of the historical ratepayers Mr. Kilkeny represents.*

2014. CHAIRMAN.—He says he is acting for a number. Do you appear, Mr. Kilkeny, for the persons who have sent in the memorial to us?

Mr. Kilkeny.—*Yes.*

2015. CHAIRMAN.—And you are authorized to appear for them!

Mr. Kilkeny.—*Yes.*

Cross-examination resumed.

2016. Mr. Kilkeny.—I believe, Mr. Gray, the people of Clontarf feel very much aggrieved at receiving on their strand nearly all the silt of the city of Dublin, which comes floating up in their direction!—I believe that is true to a considerable extent.

2017. Supposing that the people of Clontarf suffered considerable inconvenience from an unattached connection with the city—when they suffer that inconvenience don't you think they should be allowed to take some part in the conveniences in connection with the city!—I think that once this question is settled, one of the most important works which must be undertaken at once by the Corporation will be a system of main drainage, and whether Clontarf be included in the municipality or not it will be relieved from that inconvenience by the main drainage system.

2018. And of course if the main drainage of Clontarf was made more healthy it would be also a source of benefit to the city of Dublin!—But whether it was included or not it would have a right to use that main drainage under the Sanitary Act.

Mr. G. DELANT, examined.

Mr. George Delant.

2019. Mr. Heron.—You reside, I believe, at Burlington-road!—I do.

2020. Where did you reside previously to taking up your residence in that locality!—In Fitzwilliam-street about sixteen years.

2021. In what township is Burlington-road!—Pembroke township; I have lived there for the past three years.

2022. You were one of the founders, I believe, of that great commercial establishment in Sackville-street—M. Swinney and Co.!—I was, in the year 1852.

2023. You have been a citizen of Dublin all your life!—Yes; I have been.

2024. Have you been considering as taking an interest in the city and its suburbs—have you been considering the question which is the subject matter of this inquiry!—I have, post, generally, very little attention to city affairs, but I have a general view. I always entertained the opinion that it was a great mistake to allow other townships round Dublin, and to make them independent of the city. The present city would have been built out and extended in the course of time, and now these boundaries are a ring fence.

2025. Then, allowing the formation of the township, as a ring fence, you think, was a mistake on the part of the governing body of the city of Dublin!—Certainly. I suppose the evil is found out now.

2026. The valuation of the City Estate is about £750,000!—Yes, as far as I know.

2027. And the debts are about £180,000 or £190,000!—Yes.

2028. Would you be in favour, Mr. Delant, as a resident of a township, of annexation with the city of Dublin!—Well, there was a paper left at my house asking me the question whether I was in favour of the annexation or not, and I happened to open the door when the man came with that paper. He told me the proposal was to double my taxes!—

2029. That is not an agreeable process!—Yes; well I said I quite agreed with him, but that I would prefer to be in the city even if the taxation was doubled. I have property in the Pembroke township, and also in the Rathmines township, and I would be decidedly in favour of being annexed to the city, and I view the matter in this way, that property would not be prejudiced if there was a re-valuation of the city and townships. I know something of the valua-

DUBLIN.
April 12, 1872.

Mr. E. D.
Gray, M.P.

DEBATES.
April 19, 1878.
Mr. George
Deasy.

tion of the houses in the city of Dublin, and even in the locality in which I live it is much under-valued. Of course, there are other parts over-valued, but I think that an increase in the valuation, and concentration of management of the townships and city generally would equalise the taxation very much, but of course I am not prepared to go into figures. The valuation of the house where I lived, Fitzwilliam-street, is much under its real value, and so is that of the other houses both in Upper and Lower Fitzwilliam-street, and all round that neighbourhood. The house I lived in for many years I paid £100 Irish for it, and my interest in it was worth many hundreds of pounds, and it was only valued at £65, and if I look at a directory for about 1842 or 1843 I see the same house valued at £100.

2032. Then you think that one central government would be beneficial?—Yes.

2031. For what reason?—I am not generally in favour of central government, but I think a central government as regards the city affairs is desirable. I have no doubt that it would be a great benefit.

2032. A central government having their own officials, with one staff and one set of officials under one head, you think, would be a beneficial method of managing such an area as the city and these townships?—I do; just in the same way as concentration of railway management has taken place in connection with the Great Northern and other Railways. There is not only economy of management, but I think the work is done better as a rule by such changes, and there is no oscillation of interests.

2033. Such an amalgamation has, as you say, taken place on the Great Northern Railway, which is now under one management, having previously been under several boards?—Yes.

2034. With regard to the management of townships, what do you say about the management of your township—the township in which you are more immediately interested?—Well, I do not wish to speak in unfriendly terms of some of the gentlemen I know as Commissioners, but it is the worst managed place I know. I have seen on the road I live in—the Baggott-street road—two years ago, stones thrown down by the carts; you might build walls with them. They remained there for two years, and I have seen them then picking them out of the grass, putting them down, and filling the ruts made by the traffic. If you take the township in the summer, the roads are not watered; I have written to the secretary once or twice on the subject, owing to the traffic and the want of being watered, the dust became pulverized, something like tooth-powder, and every gust of wind blows it about to such an extent as to make it a positive nuisance.

2035. Are you satisfied with the lighting of your township?—It is very badly lighted. There is another matter that I am desirous of calling attention to, and as regards the lighting of the footways, the reference to it reminds me of it. I think that a change in the management would lead to an improvement, because I think the master would be better managed by the police. It is a disagreeable thing to go into the township and along some of the roads at night when one is going home. The number of "unfortunate" women that hide in the dark corners of the thoroughfares makes it an abominable nuisance and you cannot get a policeman.

2036. CHAIRMAN.—You can hardly blame the township for that?—I do not blame the township, but I believe that if the city had charge of it I think that the chief magistrate of the city would be inclined to look after it. There is no magistrate in the township.

2037. Dr. Norwood.—Do you know anything about the sanitary arrangements of Pembroke?—No, it is a subject I am not acquainted with.

2038. What is your opinion as a ratepayer and owner of property in Rathmines with regard to the management of that township?—Well, I have visited Rathmines very little, and I am not prepared to say

anything about it. But I may say I found another grievance in the present state of things, in this way, that when I removed from Fitzwilliam-street to a distance of, I may say, a stone's throw, I was removed from the burgess roll and struck off the jury list, and unless I took a house again I could not be a burgess, and then it would take me three years to exercise my right to vote.

2039. Upon the whole, then, you are in favour of amalgamating all the townships to the city?—I am.

2040. For the reasons you have stated?—Yes; I think the objection on the ground of the likelihood of an increase of taxation is a matter of mere sentiment. The thing will soon level itself.

2041. CHAIRMAN.—Would you make the townships liable, if they were brought in, to the same taxation as the ratepayers of Dublin?—I would, and I think that the poor law rate ought to be the same in both as it is equitable. The people of wealth have got outside into the townships, while the poorer residents remain inside the city, and they are very heavily taxed. I would be inclined to make it a joint tax over all, and would be opposed to a separation of their debts.

Cross-examined by Mr. Andrews.

2042. I think I gathered from you that, in your opinion, a re-valuation was an essential preliminary to the amalgamation scheme?—Yes.

2043. Would you favour me with your opinion as to the representation of property. When you have a re-valuation to what extent would you approve of the representation of property, or would you approve of it all?—Well, I would be inclined to give property a representation to some extent.

2044. Can you give me your idea how you would deal with property and how you would deal with population?—Do you mean as to voting for burgesses or representatives of the city.

2045. Entirely so?—Well, I think that owners of property in the city, but resident outside the boundary—in Kingstown and such places—I think that they should have the same power of voting.

2046. Can you give me any idea now about population?—I have not considered that.

2047. Are you in favour of the representation by population or by property?—Both—fairly balanced.

2048. But you could give me no idea of the proportions?—No, I am not prepared to answer that, as I have not studied the question sufficiently.

2049. As a general rule, you have approved of a central government?—As a general rule I do not. I allude to nations.

2050. And do you except municipalities?—I do. For instance, I think if we had local government in Ireland and a Parliament in Dublin, they would never have allowed such a thing to be done as the making of independent townships. The people would be too well educated in the matter of self-government.

2051. Then if we had what you regard as the advantage of self-government, the formation of the townships would be disengaged?—I think so.

2052. Perhaps you will give me some idea how that result would arise?—Simply because the people would understand the management of their own affairs better than they do now.

2053. And if they did understand the management of their own affairs, then you think it would be better that the townships should have their management at home?—Not separately from the city.

2054. In what way, supposing Ireland were governing itself?—I think the particular question you ask me applies in this way—that the wealthy people of the city get into the pockets, and escape taxation, which is unjust, inasmuch as they use the city.

2055. But I would like to know, for the advantage of having your views and knowing the conclusions at which you have arrived, if you had local government for Ireland you do not think amalgamation, such as is now sought by the Corporation, would be necessary?—No; for the separation would not have to take place.

-Dennis.
April 12, 1878.
Mr. George
Daleby.

2054. Is that so—I think so.

2057. And that would have arisen from the circumstance that, under that Home Government, better care would have been taken, and that better education and sounder views would have prevailed, both in the city and in the townships!—Yes.

2058. One of the great advantages you think the townships would at present gain from annexation to Dublin would be that there would be police to look after the "unfortunate" women at night!—Yes, and all such matters.

2059. Do you regard Dublin as exempt from such kinds of nuisance!—I think there is greater protection in the city.

2060. But not a less existence of the evil!—Not to the same extent, for I think those people get out to those houses places and require supervision.

2061. You transferred your residence from Dublin to the Pembroke township!—Yes.

2062. And your residence has been there—how long!—For three years.

2063. And you have property in Pembroke as well as in Dublin!—I have.

2064. What proportion does your property in Pembroke bear to your property in Dublin!—I have house property in various wards of the city.

2065. Your stake in Pembroke is considerable as compared with your interest in Dublin!—I have two-thirds of my property in Dublin and one-third in the townships; but my views are not actuated in the slightest degree as regards the matter of property in the city.

2066. Oh yes, because I see you look upon it as a matter of the most perfect indifference, even if the taxes of Pembroke should be doubled!—I do not think they would be doubled.

2067. But even if they would!—I would prefer to pay double, and get my rights as a citizen.

2068. Do you regard it as desirable to include within the urban district unbuilt-on land, to a large extent agricultural land!—If there was a connecting link formed between the city and that unbuilt-on land, I think it is quite possible and probable that within a very short period the outlying district, if connected with the city, would soon be built upon; and therefore, if the suggestions I have heard mentioned in relation to Clontarf are accurate, I would be inclined to amalgamate that township with the city, for the reason that I think it would soon become part of the city.

2069. Your view would be to annex Clontarf with the city!—It would.

2070. And what would your view be as regards the equalization of taxation. Would you tax the whole of the annual district with an equal poundage rate, or would you suggest any other plan!—I would make no exception; I would make it a uniform rate.

2071. You would bring them all in, and tax them all!—For good or evil I would join them—many them.

2072. As regards the existing debts, would you impose upon the townships the liability to the existing Dublin debts!—I think I would amalgamate the general exchequer. I understand that the Pembroke township are borrowing a large sum for main drainage purposes, and that would come to a considerable sum before it is finished. I see the rating for the purpose is 4d. at present, but I think it will come to a shilling.

2073. Well, we have some idea of what the cost of the Dublin Main drainage scheme would be, from the fact that £500,000 was insufficient to meet the tremendous demands of the scheme for Dublin. Now, supposing Dublin spent £500,000 to effect main drainage, would you put the townships on an equal rate with Dublin for it!—I would amalgamate the whole of the debts, because each one of the townships benefits by the use of the city.

Mr. REVENUE, Town Clerk, recited.

Mr. John
Beveridge.

2074. CHAIRMAN.—I see that this year the Grand Jury rate is only put down at 5d.!—That is so, sir.

2075. Does that include the city at large charges!—Yes, sir, everything. It includes the instalments due to the Government for the prisons and asylums—our contributions to the lunatic asylum, the hospitals, reformatory, and industrial schools, the Commission Court, the registration of the Parliamentary voters' lists, the militia charges for barracks, and so on, and the jurors' expenses, revising the jurors' lists, and so on.

2076. I see it has fallen. How has it fallen from 2s. 2d. to 5d., and is it at all likely to be 5d. for the future!—No, sir. My opinion is that for some two or three years it will be varying from 1s. to 1s. 2d., but after that I should think we might be able to do it for 10d., unless a new burden is thrown upon us by the Legislature.

2077. How does it happen to be so much less for this year!—It is chiefly owing to the fact that the city accountant drew my attention to the fact that for some years the charges for Grand Jury fees were realising, or ought to realise, more than the sums estimated for; and when we made a careful estimate of what surplus ought to be in the hands of the Collector-General, after the present Collector-General had come into office, and taking a moderate estimate, we thought within this year and between this and next year, we could get in £11,000 over and above Realities, and so we struck a Grand Jury rate to levy the balance only of the sums presented for.

2078. In point of fact, so far from the rates being 4s. 6d., you think they should be 5d. more!—My estimate is 1s. exceeding this. We are in a transition state with regard to the lunatic asylums, for which we have been raising money to pay what the Govern-

ment lent us. Now we are required to estimate in advance, and the result is that we have to clear off the old debt, although providing for the intermediate period, and presenting in advance. You will see that in the small schedule for the last Michaelmas Presentments, section 2, "expenses of lunatic asylums," we have presented for the sum of £2,092 9s. 6d. to clear with the Government, to the 31st of December, 1877. The Treasury has advanced one sum to cover the intermediate period, and we paid them back this year one-third of that, £7,368 6s. 7d. We will have to levy the same sum next year and the year following, and then that charge will disappear altogether. We have presented for £5,328 7s. under the provisions of the Lunatic Asylums Act of last year, and that was the estimated sum to cover the expense of the maintenance of the Richmond Lunatic Asylum, from the 1st of July, 1878, to the 31st of March, 1879, but the Government delayed to send us the presentment that would have covered the period from the 31st of March, 1878, up to the end of the year.

2079. And that will have to be provided for next year!—Yes; but in the meantime the Government must do something to advance the money for the asylum, as it is their mistake—a mistake in the Chief Secretary's office.

2080. That being the state of things with regard to the city-at-large charges, are you able to tell us how much the townships pay for county-at-large charges!—You will find that stated at page 26 in the return of the Local Government Board for the year 1877, which I have also got in evidence. Blackrock township contributed £1,045; Clontarf, £313; Kilmainham, £94; Pembroke, £2,520, and Rathmines and Rathgar, £5,001.

2081. Mr. CORR.—Can you give us any similar

BREWER,
April 18, 1878.
Mr. John
Berwick.

information with regard to the yellow portions in the baronies of Upperross, Coolock, and Rathdown!—It could be ascertained easily from the collectors' returns.

2032. What are the portions in the county which it is proposed to annex—the portions not constituted in the townships?—The total amount apparently produced could be summarised in that way. It would be about £2,000 altogether, and then some small portion of that goes to the county-at-large charges.

2033. Now suppose that what the Corporation proposes to have taken in, namely, those five townships, and the portions of the county represented in these baronies, are brought in and form a portion of the city, what will be the effect of that with respect to the Grand Jury rate?—Will it lessen the £d. rate or increase it?—What will the effect be?—It will impose upon the townships, beyond all doubt, a larger amount for county-at-large charges than they pay at present.

2034. Supposing the townships and the portion of the county proposed to be included within the present municipality of Dublin, how much would the Grand Jury rate be?—Apparently it would lessen very much the tax upon the county-at-large portions which are not included in the townships, but I am not sufficiently up in the matter to be able to tell you exactly. At present they are paying a very large sum—they are paying £s. 4½d. this time in the Coolock barony.

2035. CHAIRMAN.—Is that all the rate they pay, with the exception of the sanitary and poor rate?—Quite so.

2036. They will have to pay instead of in the case of Coolock, of £s. 4½d., their share of the improvement rate with the other rates!—Quite so.

2037. And they will have to pay a much larger sum towards the city-at-large charges than the sum they pay towards the county-at-large charges!—That would be perfectly just, especially in regard to one portion that on the left hand side of the Circular-road as you go towards Grangegorman from the Phoenix Park, all that is, practically, villa. The left hand side is the county of Dublin, and those villas have all the advantage of our lighting; and up to the laying of the tram line the Corporation, in order to make no doubt as to where their responsibility over the road ran, scavenged the whole of that road; but now that the tramway runs through the centre of the road, have ceased to do so. The county ratepayers have been greatly dissatisfied with the manner in which they have been neglected for years. Well, if that portion of the district was brought within the city boundary, we would be

enabled to spend the city funds in putting it into the state of repair that it ought to be in.

2038. But that does not settle what Mr. Coston asked you as to how much their rate would be increased for the city-at-large charges, beyond what they pay at present for county-at-large charges,—no doubt it must be increased!—It would be very easy for the accountant to make out that calculation. Indeed I think he has handed in that calculation already.

2039. Dr. Norwood.—Perhaps the schedule of the amounts to be raised on each barony during the year 1878, and in the county, show the ratio of the county proportion, the barony proportions, the proportions in the townships, and the total. Have you examined that, because it would bring us some way towards the calculation?

Mr. Berwick.—I wish to say that the city has been relieved now of the expenditure on account of the city prisons with the exception of providing for the pensioners until all the pensioners die out.

2040. And how much will that save on the city at-large charges?—

CHAIRMAN.—We have already, I understand, got this calculation, and it amounts to this—that suppose the whole thing is amalgamated Dublin would save about £d. in the £, and the several townships would be increased in their taxation!—Quite so.

2041. The increase would be on the townships, we may take it, of £s. 8d. for Rathmines, 9d. for Pembroke, 8d. for Kilmainham, 1s. for Drumcondra!—Yes.

2042. Similarly the rates payable by what is called the county portion would be as follows:—The barony of Rathdown. Is that what we call the Roshcreek district?—It includes Roshcreek. Roshcreek is a portion of the barony.

2043. Mr. Corcoran.—We have got Grangegorman, Dolphin's-bawn, Terenure, and Roshcreek!—Those two—Roshcreek and Dolphin's-bawn—are included in Rathdown barony; they would be increased from £s. 9½d. to £s. 12½d.—not to £s. 13½d.?—Yes, quite so.

2044. They would be increased by £s. 2½d. Yes. The proportion for the barony of Coolock would be increased by £s. 7½d.

2045. CHAIRMAN.—It is at present £s. 4½d., and it will be increased by £s. 1½d. —Yes.

2046. And Upperross at present is £s. 4d., and that would be increased by £s. 8d. —Yes. In Michaelmas, 1877, the amount presented for prisons was £6,383—that included all salaries and all expenses. There has, therefore, been a large relief on that head, and also on the head of lunatic asylums, as the Government pays a very large contribution towards the main tenance of lunatics.

Alderman John
W. Gregg.

2047. Mr. Heron.—I believe you have been for about fourteen years a member of the Corporation!—I have.

2048. And are you now the Chairman, or have you been the Chairman of the Paving, Cleaning, and Lighting Committee?—Yes; I was last year.

2049. Have you for a considerable time interested yourself in the street works?—Yes.

2050. While you have been on the Paving Committee have very many great works been executed in the city?—Yes.

2051. Just mention some of them!—Do you mean as regards paving?

2052. Yes!—There have been a great number of the principal streets of the city done—for instance, North King-street, William-street, Britain-street, &c.

2053. CHAIRMAN.—How many streets have been paved?—I cannot tell you that just this minute; but I know that we have expended, at all events, the sum of £50,000, with the exception of a small amount of material in stock. I can tell you also that even since

Alderman John William Gregg, examined.

so late as 1869, between the tramways and the Corporation, there has been expended upon the city of Dublin in the shape of paving alone over £120,000.

2054. Between the Corporation and the tramways?—Yes.

2055. I see from the return that there were 25 principal streets paved!—Yes—principal streets; and of course there were a great many smaller ones done too.

2056. Mr. Heron.—Has that expenditure been a great and lasting benefit to the city?—Yes; especially those streets done on the Manchester system. Among the streets done in that way I may mention Nassau-street, which was done in asphalt with granite "sets." That is the Manchester system. Moore-street, William-street, South King-street, Clare-street, Middle Abbey-street, Dawson-street, Great and Little Britain street, and Hawkins-street, and they are going on with Townsend-street now.

2057. Have you considered the question of the amalgamation of the townships with the city?—Yes, I have given it some little thought.

2108. And are you in favour of amalgamation?—I am; and perhaps my views are a little permissive to a certain extent—that is, I think that all the immediate neighbourhoods of the city should be under one authority, so as to form a uniform boundary. And I would prefer not having the extreme outlying districts of the townships, but on the whole I am in favour of amalgamation.

2109. I believe you have paid considerable attention to the question of the Fire Brigade?—Yes, sir.

2110. Are you on the committee that attends to the Fire Brigade?—No; I am not on the Waterworks Committee at all; but I took some years ago an interest in the matter in connexion with the Fins Insurance Companies.

2111. Is there a report on the subject?—There is.

2112. And signed by you, and in reference to the vast amount of property saved?—Yes; there was a special committee appointed at my suggestion to take into consideration the exigencies of the Fire Brigade at that time, and its wants, and its uses as well, not only with the view of endeavouring to get the fire insurance companies who have offices in Dublin to assist, and to contribute something towards the maintenance of the Brigade, because as we considered that the fire office had a great interest in the saving of property, and we intended ultimately to apply to the townships also for a contribution, and with those contributions it was intended to establish stations in the outlying districts, and have telegraphic communication with the head office in Dublin, so that the expenses and the losses that might be incurred in consequence of fire might be reduced to a minimum by the arrangements we contemplated at the time.

2113. Are you of opinion that the Fire Brigade should be increased in strength?—Most decidedly.

2114. How much do you consider should be spent on the Fire Brigade?—Well, the income is about £8,000 a year now, and it would certainly take double that amount to make it efficient—about £6,000. It is at present supported by a contribution of 1½d in the £ off the water rate—that is all the waterworks are allowed to give under their Act of Parliament.

2115. Mr. CORROX.—I think we were told that £3,600 was made available?—It is increasing every year on account of the increase of the valuation. It was some years ago only £3,000.

2116. CHAIRMEN.—Do not the insurance offices give you something towards the cost of maintaining the Fire Brigade?—Not a halfpenny.

2117. Mr. HERON.—I find that the insurance companies in London give £19,000 a year to the support of the Fire Brigade?—Yes, and more than that. The London insurance companies give £19,000 towards the maintenance of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade, and in London the Metropolitan Board of Works is authorized to inspect the books of the insurance companies, and make a certain calculation on the risks, and they assess the income of the insurance companies at the rate of £35 per £1,000,000 risks, and the result of that has been that the year before last the income derivable from the insurance companies' contribution towards the maintenance of the Fire Brigade was £12,000, and I believe it is now nearly £20,000. The Government also contributes to the maintenance of the Fire Brigade by a sum of £10,000, which is given for the protection of Government buildings. The Government does not, however, give anything for the maintenance of our Fire Brigade in Dublin.

2118. Don't the Liverpool companies also give a small subscription?—In Liverpool the principle has been so far recognized that they have effected a compromise in the matter, and that compromise consists in the insurance companies giving a sum of £650, so that the principle which is in force in London has been admitted in Liverpool. In Manchester they give £3,500 a year also, and whenever they go outside the township are bound also to give a certain sum toward the expense.

2119. Is that by Act of Parliament?—Yes, I suppose so.

2120. Mr. CORROX.—Do the townships contribute besides that?—Only when a fire occurs. The insurance offices give for the city.

2121. But the townships?—No; only when there is a fire.

2122. Mr. WALKER.—They pay for the particular service to a fire outside?—Yes. (The witness then referred to a quotation from the Town Clerk's letter to him, showing that there was about an equal amount contributed outside the city of Manchester by the local boards for such services.) In Birmingham the insurance companies voluntarily submit to the city charges made by the Corporation there when expenses are incurred at a fire in which they have insurance. In the same way at Belfast and Birmingham if a fire occurs outside the borough there is 50 per cent. added to the cost as a set-off charge.

Mr. HERON.—I find by your report that the year 1873 was a most disastrous year as regards the destruction of property by fire. There were no less than 250 fires and the value of the property destroyed amounted to £135,000.

2123. CHAIRMEN.—Was that in Dublin?—Yes; that was the year of the whiskey fire in Chambre-street, and there was £130,000 lost there.

2124. Mr. HERON.—Should there, in your opinion, be more than one station?—From conversations I have had with Captain Ingram I have come to the conclusion that I would have at least six stations at a certain distance from the centre of the city—from the head office; and further out than that I would have a station in each township, and all stations should be in telegraphic communication with the head office. There would be, of course, a small engine in each of these stations, and a certain number of men.

2125. And power to bring all the men on duty to any great fire that might occur?—Yes, of course, by telegraphic communication.

2126. Why do the insurance companies not contribute in Dublin?—The only reason they assigned while I was in correspondence with the "Sun" office was that if they did it for Dublin they would be bound by the example to contribute to the brigades of all the cities of the kingdom, and though I have pressed upon them the example of London as a precedent, for at all events supporting the brigade in Dublin, yet they, after a lengthy correspondence with the leading offices in Dublin, declined to contribute anything. I must say that I think that one of the local offices—one of our own Irish offices—was the means of contributing to the prejudice that the offices had in contributing—I must say so reluctantly—to the support of the Fire Brigade in the city. I may add that the managers of many of the insurance offices which have branches here were quite willing to contribute, and many of them submitted the justice of doing so at the time.

2127. Which office stepped in, as it is a matter of public interest?—It is not a matter of necessity that I should mention it; I heard it afterwards.

2128. CHAIRMEN.—I suppose you are of opinion that residents in the townships who have places of business in the city are interested in the keeping up of the Corporation Fire Brigade for the sake of the places that those residents have in the city?—Yes, I think so.

2129. Mr. HERON.—Have the principal roadways in the city leading towards these townships been greatly improved in recent years—Baggott-street for instance?—Do you mean city roadways?

2130. Yes.—Yes, they have.

2131. Did you happen to be on the Donnybrook-road last Sunday, and did you see the dust on it?—No, I did not; some of them present a great contrast—*I mean* some of the roads contiguous to the city.

2132. Pimlico-road is in a dreadful state at present, is it not?—I do not think it is so bad as Baggott-road.

2133. Do you happen to know the approach to the

DUNLOP
April 17, 1880.
Alderman
John W.
Grigg.

Demand.
April 25, 1879.
Alderman
John W.
Gough.

houses on the right hand side of Pembroke-road as you go from the city!—Well, I think its condition is owing to the sewer work going on there.

2134. Do you know the actual amount laid out in the city on repairs and maintenance as regards sewerage?—Since the Corporation came into office I think something like £240,000 has been expended on the main sewer.

2135. Mr. Walker.—That is since 1849!—Yes, since 1849.

2136. Mr. Heron.—You know the Corporation has not the control of the supply of gas; have you considered that question? Are you of opinion that the Corporation should have the supplying of gas to the city!—I was when I took an active part in endeavouring to enable the Corporation to buy the gas works.

2137. You are aware that in other great cities the Corporation have the supplying of gas, and in every single instance such undertakings have been financial successes.

CHAIRMAN.—But we have nothing to say to that.

2138. Mr. Heron.—Is the public lighting of the city in a satisfactory state!—Well, it could be improved. The expense even at the reduced rate is a rather heavy item upon the resources of the Corporation.

2139. Are all the public lamps of the city kept lighted all night!—They are lighted at a certain hour—from sunrise to sunset. Of course some must be extinguished and lighted at more irregular hours than others. The city is divided into districts.

2140. Do you wish to make any further explanation or suggestion!—Well, there are two things which strike me as showing that it was a pity that there was not a unity and concurrence of opinion as regards some of the works that go on simultaneously between the city and the townships. There was before us some time ago when the tramways were going over Charlemont-bridge a proposal to lower that bridge in a similar way to that in which Portobelle-bridge was lowered—that is, at the expense of the joint contiguity of the Corporation, the township, and the tramway company. But the Charlemont-bridge suggestion fell through owing to a want of unity of opinion between the three parties, and the result is that we have that heavy bridge still remaining, and not like Portobelle, which latter bridge was lowered and widened.

2141. Did Rathmines contribute towards the lowering of Portobelle!—Yes, and the tramway company, and the Corporation also. I think it is very perceptible the endeavour of the Corporation to improve the approaches to the city, as far as in them lies, by rendering that part of the roadway as perfect as possible. For instance, in that outlet to the Park going alongside the Castle Market, the pathway has been greatly improved to the great comfort of the inhabitants of the north side walking to the Park. The pathway has been laid down properly, and that portion next the market has been raised in to prevent the cattle going on it, whereas on the other side of the road—the south side—there is scarcely a pathway at all; it is full of rats, and a disgrace to the place, and a perfect nuisance and offence until the last year, but they have been filling it up lately.

2142. Did the Chancery Commissioners contribute to the improvement of Aansley-bridge!—I think they did. I think the Commissioners, the railway company, the Corporation, and the tramway company contributed.

Cross-examined by Mr. Walker.

2143. Looking at the map showing the line that the Corporation propose to take in, is it your opinion that all that should be annexed!—I would prefer a more uniform boundary.

2144. Where would you draw the line!—I would take in portion of Clentarf—that portion that runs across by the railway—and I would take in portion of Drumcondra; I would extend the limits to a uniform distance from the boundaries of the city all round.

2145. That is from the heart of the city!—Yes.

2146. How far would you draw the line—how far would you go into Rathmines and Rathgar!—I would go as far as old Rathmines.

2147. And what about Kilmainham!—And I would take in a portion of Kilmainham, and I have taken in some of Crumlin, although it is waste; there are no houses upon it.

2148. And part of Pembroke!—And part of Pembroke in the same way, down to Ball's-bridge.

2149. Have you considered the terms upon which you would make that amalgamation!—Well, I have only considered the terms in a general way.

2150. You have given great attention to this question of annexation!—I don't think I have given as much attention to it as other members of the Corporation or other people.

2151. CHAIRMAN.—Then you would divide the township, in point of fact!—Perhaps that would be telling greatly in favour of Dublin, because we would get a great many of the wealthy houses near Dublin into the city. For instance, I think with regard to the Pembroke-road the division or separation of that road from the city is only the canal. The canal is a very slight division, and I think that really the city ought to extend out to Ball's-bridge.

2152. Why should you stop at Ball's-bridge, and not bring in the whole of the township!—I think there would be more or less expense—I am speaking from a city point of view—there would be more or less expense in managing the outlying district, the portions of the district furthest off from the city.

2153. We have heard from the city officers, and they have told us that those districts could be managed with very little expense!—I certainly think there would be economy in utilising the staffs.

2154. And if so, the rates to be got from the townships would more than pay for the keeping up of the roads and the extra staff!—There is a great question in the townships—that the portions of the townships furthest from the city are more or less open, and not yet built on to where the townships extend to.

2155. Would not there be great difficulty in dividing the township!—What would you do with the debts of that township!—Well, that is only an individual opinion of mine as to the matter of boundary. I am not saying that my proposal would be the best scheme to have accepted.

2156. Well, we have it at least that you are not in favour of the full extension proposed by the Corporation!—I would prefer that rather than not have any.

2157. Mr. Walker.—And practically for the same reasons that influence you individually in choosing a more limited area!—Yes.

Mr. Heron.—We have now closed the case for the Corporation.

CHAIRMAN.—If any ratepayer or other citizen wishes to give evidence in support of, or in opposition to the proposal of the Corporation for an extension of the present municipal area, we shall be happy to hear him.

Mr. John M'Evoy examined.

2158. Mr. M'Evoy.—Before giving my evidence, I wish to be understood not to be a witness for the Corporation.

2159. CHAIRMAN.—You have taken a great interest

in these Corporation affairs and in the municipal affairs of the townships also!—Yes, sir, I have. I have put down here on a memorandum that I hold in my hand a few single matters of fact that I pro-

pose to bring before you, without offering any opinion, unless I am asked for it. The first thing that I would wish to bring under your notice is that the question of the boundaries of the city of Dublin has long ago been the subject of serious consideration. The Town Clerk, in his evidence, told you about the changes made under the Act of 1840. That Act of 1840 was founded upon a report of a Municipal Inquiry Commission, which sat here in 1835, and I find that that Commission took evidence on the subject of the boundaries of Dublin at the time, and here is what they say in their report:—

"The increase of population and modern improvements has in many places produced a considerable extension of the Corporate town beyond the original borough limits. This is remarkable, the case in the city of Dublin, a very large proportion of which, in extent and opulence, is not within the Corporate jurisdiction or constitutary to the local Grand Jury assessments."

I find by the Census Report of 1841 the effect of the changes made by the Act of 1840. They added to the city of Dublin at that time the greater part of the parish of St. George, with a population of over 15,000, and portions of several other parishes, amounting in all to a population of 43,000. That was what was added but, strangely enough, a portion that at present remains within the Parliamentary borough of the city was taken out. This is called the Barony of Dublin. It comprises a number of parishes, which were constituted into a new barony, and called the Barony of Dublin.

2160. CHAIRMAN.—That was taken out of the ancient city, is it?—Yes. A net increase of 31,000 of population was at that time made to the city of Dublin, I have endeavoured to find some reason for the taking out of this district at that time. The Kingstown Railway had been opened, and there was evidently a tendency of the population in that direction, yet those who were then acting in the interests of the city thought it advisable for the interests of the city to take the district out, and they did so.

2161. Is that district down towards Kingstown?—It extends to the Cross of Blackrock, and now forms the greater part of the township of Pembroke. That district was taken out of the city in 1840, and it is remarkable how it increased from that time in population. It grew from 12,000 in 1841 to 18,780 in 1861. It was not until 1863 that it was made into a township. It was left to the county—left to itself, and it grew in this remarkable way—fifty per cent. In the number of houses there was a growth in the same ratio, for in 1841 the number was almost 1,700, while in 1861 it had reached 2,602. That is just an illustration to show how little after all we need costly municipal organizations for purposes of our real progress. Again, in 1849, there was a municipal revolution in Dublin. The Corporation created in 1846 was dissolved and a new Corporation formed. I have read over carefully the discussions at the time, and I find that it was not then proposed to extend the boundaries. All parties seemed to be satisfied to leave the district outside to itself, and so it was accordingly left to itself. In the case of Rathmines, which adopted municipal institutions in 1847, a township was formed, and in 1863 Pembroke did the same. I have looked into the important question of how borough boundaries and township boundaries have been extended. It is a self-evident proposition that with the growth of population there must be these extensions, and the law has long ago provided for such things, first in England, and latterly in this country. In England, under the Local Government Act, since 1858 they have, under the provisional order system, every year extended boundaries of boroughs and townships; since 1871 we have had that system extended to this country; but little use seems to have been made of it. Through the system of private Bill legislation, not only in England, but here, every year, we have had opportunities of

observing the process of legislation. In 1863 Rathgar was in that way annexed to Rathmines, and Rathmines was so extended in 1863 by a private Act. In 1874, Kingstown was extended under a private Act—I think it is of very great importance to show the principle upon which all these extensions, both under the general Act and by private Bill legislation, have been carried out. I find that under both the English and Irish Local Government Acts the whole thing turns upon mutual consent. The consent of the local authority that is about to take over the district, and the consent of the ratepayers of both districts is all distinctly provided for in all these general Acts, and there is machinery provided for holding local inquiries to ascertain the assent or dissent of the ratepayers and all concerned.

2162. Mr. CORCORAN.—What is the Act to which you are now referring?—The Act of 1871—the Irish Local Government Act of 1871. It has been amended by Acts since then, under the last Public Health Act there have been increased powers given to the Local Government Board of a very valuable character for this very purpose of extending townships and annexing districts when they are consenting parties to the annexation. In the case of private Bills for the purpose, I find that in the year 1876 there was a remarkable case. It was the case of the Corporation of Glasgow, who promoted an extension Bill to take in some of the adjoining districts—among others, the burgh of Croyhill—a burgh that had been provided under an Act of Parliament with a local authority of its own. That local authority opposed the Bill, and their counsel in his statement of the case before the Committee on the Bill stated that it was the law of Parliament, and there was no instance to the contrary of any local authority, without any misconduct on its part, being dissolved, or its district handed over to a neighbouring authority without the consent of the majority of the owners and ratepayers of the district. That was not contended by the counsel on the other side, and the Bill was thrown out. I observe that the Town Clerk in his evidence cited some English cases of extensions, and I have had the opportunity, as he has been good enough to let me see them, of reading the two Acts of Parliament he referred to—one was the Darlington extension of 1873, and the other is the extension of the borough of Bolton in 1877. I find that the Darlington extension was simply an extension of the borough limits over to the gas and water limits which the Corporation previously had. They had under gas and water Act power to supply gas and water outside their borough before this Act passed, and they got this extension of the borough over their gas and water limit. In the case of Bolton there was one local board dissolved—the Local Board of Hallewell.

2163. Was that done by consent?—Yes, that was done, I find, by consent. I have made inquiries from the Parliamentary agent concerned in the matter at the time as to what was done in that case, and I find that the local board of Hallewell petitioned the House of Lords against the Bill, but before the Bill went into Committee they withdrew their opposition, and I find further, and the Act will show it—and I would like the Town Clerk to allow me to have that Act for a moment—[the Act is handed to the witness]. I wish to mention here, that I think it is useful to show that there were terms made between the Corporation and the local board in the case to which I am now referring. There was a portion of the township taken in and a portion excluded. The township of Astley was excluded because they could not agree. But you will find here by this Act, that the portion of the township of Hallewell that adopted the Act had themselves separated for rating purposes from the rest of the borough. There is in the schedules to the Act the Hallewell rating district is set forth, and you will find from the Act how that is to work. They were to have separate accounts kept—separate accounts

DUBLIN.
April 12, 1874.
Mr. John
McEvoy.

BENNETT,
Lloyd 18. 1878.
Mr. John
McEvoy.

of each rating district—they were to establish a fund to be called the District fund, and the Corporation was to keep a separate account of the rates spent for sanitary purposes in respect of each of the rating districts. The sanitary expenses are defined in a very large way. Sanitary purposes mean and include the making and maintaining of streets and high-ways, the providing of improved lighting, scavenging, and sewerage, the prevention of nuisance, the preservation of the health of the extended borough, and the power of the Corporation in relation to the Crake and other streams. So that you will see that included nearly everything that a municipal Corporation has to do. The district would only pay for its own expense in all those matters, and I think it will be found to be the same in other cases. I have here a specimen of one of these accounts—the Corporation of Liverpool's accounts for district townships that they have taken over in the same way, and have under their management. I see here in these accounts for those different townships that they have different accounts and separate rates. Now, for instance, the township of Kirkdale has a paving rate of £1. 0*sd*, and for that they get water, scavenging, and paving. Then I go on and I find that the township of Everton has got the same thing for 3*sd*. in the pound—one pays £1. 0*sd*, and the other 3*sd*. The sewer rate also, is separate, West Derby, another of the townships, pays 10*sd*.

2164. Are they not all managed by the Town Council?—They are, but they are not thrown into the one common rating district; they are kept separate for these purposes. I merely mention this as a matter of fact, whatever way it may affect this inquiry. In the case before you there is this 4*sd*. rate of which you have spoken, and the suggestion has been made that all the townships should be brought into the city under one common fund. I find that there are certain rates that I do not think any one would consider could be dealt with in that way. First, there is the water rate of £1. 8*sd*. in the pound imposed in the city. The same thing is provided for, I believe, in the township of Pembroke for either 7*sd*. or 8*sd*.—a 3*sd*. water rate, and they have in addition to that to provide for the interest on the sinking fund on the money borrowed for laying down their mains—that I understand to be represented by another 3*sd*. or 4*sd*. Well, according to that, there is a difference between the two of 7*sd*. in the pound for water purposes. Now that was brought about with, I think, appear to have been by the act of the Corporation itself. The Vestry Act was founded upon the report of Sir John Hawkhurst, who in his report, and I have had an opportunity of hearing him say the same thing, said that if he had been considering only the city of Dublin he would not have recommended so extensive a scheme; but he considered that the water supply would be available not only for the city, but for the townships, and in considering the question as a whole, he did not think he was going too far in proposing so extensive a scheme for that large district. Well, the Vestry Act was founded upon that report, and the Act provided for the supply of these townships and out-lying districts.

2165. Does that include Bray, or merely the townships we are talking of in connexion with the present proposal of the Corporation?—Yes, Bray and Delaney, and all the other places included within the water district. It is provided for in that way:—it gave the Corporation power to borrow a sum of £75,000 for laying mains through those districts, and having laid them they were entitled to charge the domestic water rate of Dublin to the persons who took the water outside. They would be in the position of a water company, and parties would deal voluntarily with them for the water. That is the system in all the English boroughs. All the English Corporations who have a water supply, supply water outside their limits, and the Dublin Corporation could have done exactly the same, for they got exactly the same

powers as the Liverpool, Manchester, and other Corporations got. Well, the Corporation did not think fit to carry the Act out; they used the £75,000 otherwise, and they proposed, amongst other things, to the Pembroke Commissioners—to supply them with water at a bulk rate, and let them lay them under through their district. Now, that was not forced on the Corporation by Parliament, or by anyone; it was their voluntary act to do this. It is a bad bargain for the city; it has worked out what we have now, but I do not think it would be listened to for a moment that this bargain should now be set aside. You will observe in the case of Blackrock—Blackrock is left as it is—that is the proposal before you.

2166. Yet, now, there was a bargain made with that township too—with Blackrock. It was made in the same year, at the same time, and under exactly the same circumstances as that made with Pembroke. They both got their Acts in 1863. I know about the negotiations going on at the time with the two townships, and that they were settled at the same time, under the same circumstances, and on the same basis, and is it to be said, because one is just outside the city area, in consequence of that area being extended two miles from the city, that in a few years the bargain is to be upset?—I do not suppose that one bargain is to be upheld and the other set aside. Passing from that, I come to another rate levied this year on the city. It is a rate of 1*sd*. in the pound, Vestry cosa. I find by the city accounts that to the authorities for the present year, the total amount due to them is £530, and that the Corporation had in hand at the beginning of the year to pay that sum £430, so that they had only £90 to provide for, yet they struck a rate of 1*sd*. in the pound.

2167. Is not that rate becoming less every year?—Yes; every year an annuity is struck off it of course becomes less.

2168. Do you mean to say that the total amount to the authorities was only £200 odd?—Yes; £230: they had a balance from former rates, and they had only £90 to provide for, yet they struck a rate of 1*sd*.

2169. But that will not affect the townships?—No; it will not. Then there is a two-penny rate for a system of partial domestic scavenging. This is included in the 1*sd*. of the improvement rate. It has been described as a partial system of domestic scavenging. It is well that it is so described, for this rate of 1*sd*. in the pound would be wholly insufficient for anything like a complete system—such as they have in the English boroughs—of domestic scavenging. This would cost Dublin £12,000 to carry out, and either the Corporation must carry it out early next year, or very likely the rate will be opposed, and I think it could be with some justice opposed. That also I do not think could be imposed on the townships. The next thing would be the effect of a re-valuation. There can be no doubt that the townships, being the newer, and their valuation being of a later period, are valued at somewhat higher rate than the city is, and the re-adjustment of valuation would increase the city valuation perhaps relatively to the other by ten per cent., and that would make a difference of 4*sd*. in the rating. So that taking that and other matters, about which I think the townships would probably raise questions; for instance, the charge for keeping up such officials as sword bearers, high constables, city marshals, and so on. I think it would come to this, that the city could not by any possibility have any of its taxation reduced by the carrying out of a system of annexation. I do not think it would be allowed, nor do I think it would be possible, that any of the present rating on the city could be reduced by the annexation of the townships.

2170. With regard to that, is it your idea that the townships should contribute in any way towards the roads of the city that they use so largely?—Certainly not.

DUBLIN.
April 12, 1878.
Mr. John
McNally.

2171. Do you think that they injure the roads at all?—The only just way in which you could make every one who uses a road pay for it is by establishing a turnpike system. The fact of a man living in the township does not make it follow that he uses the city roads.

2172. Now there is Upper Lissen-street and Lower Lissen-street. There is the name Lissen-street applied to both. Upper Lissen-street is in the Rathmines township, and the other is in the city. Well, the man that draws his coal right up to the last house in Lissen-street next to the Lissen-street Bridge within the city boundary has to pay for the maintenance of the city roads. But if you go over the bridge, and a man brings his coal to the first house over the bridge, that man does not contribute a farthing to the repair of the roads over which he has carried his coal. Do you think that fair?—The farmers and private gentlemen living beyond the limits of that township on the very same thing. They use the township roads in just the same way, and besides that a larger number of them are more likely to have carts and carriages to use the roads.

2173. Don't you think that would go far in support of the argument that a certain district around the town should be made to contribute to the support of that town—that the larger the town, and the more populous the suburbs are, and the more gentry living there, the more reasonable it is that they should contribute towards that town. If it is right to increase the area around a small town, such as Malahide, Skibbereen, or such small places, to the extent of two miles, on the principle that the people living within that two miles area was the town largely and should contribute for the purpose of keeping up the lighting, paving, and so on—why on earth should not the city of Dublin have a similar rule applied to it, and that the people living within a certain area of Dublin should contribute something towards the city charges?—I think that if people living within a two-mile limit use a small town as a thoroughfare there would be a good deal in your argument; but I think that when they come in to do business it is the duty of those living in the city or town to provide them with roads to enable them to reach their places of business, or to reach their markets, and to reach the places where those outlying people come to spend money in the town.

2174. Well, then there is the coal merchant, who is living say at Rathmines or Pembroke townships, and that man uses the streets of the city for carting up his coal to the township. The people who reside there go to that man and buy from him, and they pay him an extra rate I am sure for the carriage of the coal from the quay. Well, they pay an extra price, and the coal is carried over the roads of the city to the township, and treat it not of necessarily soil and injure them?—You will have to take as a set off against that the stones that are wanted for the city are brought over the township roads. My opinion is that you cannot get strict justice unless you establish the turnpike system, and make every vehicle that passes over the road pay.

2175. The Legislature have established that to a certain extent already, for they have put a bridge tax upon the whole of the Metropolitan Police District?—As you mention that, I may state that I have had some opportunities of studying the "inns" and "outs" of the bridge tax case. In 1872 there was a Bill introduced for the purpose of dealing with the question. I was Chairman of the Kingstown Township Commissioners at the time; we opposed the Bill, and I had to look into the matter somewhat closely. Generally, it appears to me a strange affair altogether, and it is one that is very difficult to turn into a precedent. The Port of Dublin extends on the south side to Dalkey, or about there. The Port proper extends not to Dalkey under the old Acts of Parliament, and the charge for the quay walls of the Port was imposed on property as far as Dalkey. That went on

until 1837 or thereabouts. The new police system was then adopted. Under a Port Act they adopted the Port District of the Dublin Metropolis as the area of taxation for the maintenance of the quay walls. In 1849 the Municipal revolution, which I mentioned just now, took place, and among other things that happened in Dublin, was the abolition of the system of collecting the rates. The Port had its rate collector for the purpose of collecting these quay wall dues. Well, their powers were abolished, and the rate was overlooked in the new Rates Act, and the new Collector-General had no power to collect these quay wall rates. This went on until 1854, when the Ballast Board appealed to the Government to bring in a Bill to collect the tax and the arrears, and a Bill was brought in for the purpose. I have seen that Bill, and I know that it was a Bill that was meant to remedy the Act of 1849, and to enable the Collector-General to collect the arrears of the quay wall tax, and to pay it over to the Ballast Board, and of course the future quay wall taxes also. Whilst the Bill was going through Parliament, a deputation of the Dublin Corporation waited on the Chief Secretary, who at that time was a gentleman who did not know much about local affairs in Dublin, and appealed to him for power to rebuild Carlisle Bridge. His answer was that he would give the Port Board power to build it, and he had an amendment introduced into the Bill then pending, extending the power to levy rates for the quay walls to the bridges, and perhaps without knowing much of Dublin, he extended it over the whole Metropolitan Police District. That was done without notice to those interested. I believe the townships, who might have opposed the Bill, had no notice whatever of it. It was a most extraordinary proceeding, but what has been done—I allude to the proceedings of the other day—is, at all events, been done by consent.

2176. Is it the putting on of the 2d. t.—Yes, the townships did not oppose that.

2177. Didn't oppose it in one thing, but they even carried the principle farther, for they not only extended it to the entire of the Metropolitan District, but put in Clontarf and a portion of Drumcondra that was not in the Metropolitan District?—Yes, but they did it by consent.

2178. There is nothing in the Act of Parliament short "by consent"?—Well they didn't oppose it.

2179. Was not the old quay wall tax imposed in order that the quays could be kept up for the benefit of every one using them, generally?—Yes, within the port limits.

2180. The port limits at that time went down to D1.—They did.

2181. And now extend to Dalkey?—Yes.

2182. Do persons living outside the Park, at Palmerston, Chapelizod, and those places, pay the bridge tax?—I think if they had opposed the Bill they would not, perhaps, have to pay it. All these things are perfectly fair by consent.

2183. Do you find as a rule that the people ever consent to tax themselves?—Well, I have seen people enlightened enough to consent to pay taxes, and even to seek to pay them. I have known a case where such people even provided a Bill for the purpose of taxation, and I have myself been the promoter of a Bill for that purpose, and had subscriptions to the amount of £500 for the purpose.

2184. Do you know that the butchers of Rathmines and the other townships buy their cattle in the Dublin cattle market, and have them driven through the streets of the city, and he carries on his trade in that way for his customers in the townships; and are the markets and streets to be used by him, and for his benefit in this way, without any contribution from him towards repairing and scavenging the streets which he thus uses?—I do not offer any opinion about it, but I do not think you will find an instance of Parliament throwing such expenses upon a township.

DURHAM,
April 19, 1878.
Mr. John
McEvoy.

without its consent. I do not think there is an instance of it.

2185. Do you know anything about the case of Nottingham? The Town Clerk informed us that it absorbed four districts, comprising an enormous area!—I asked the Town Clerk would he get a copy of the Act, and he says he has written for it. I have myself written for information as to how the Bill passed.

2186. The quantity they have taken in amounts to 8,000 acres!—I think that is about the extent of the Nottingham extension. Two years before they got their Act they got the gas works on very favourable terms, and that is a point to notice in all the English extensions—it is usual for the district if they do not already supply gas or water to obtain those powers. The greater part of these extensions are of this character, and it is of manifest advantage to the outlying district to be included, because by becoming a part of the borough they get the water and gas at reduced rates. The practice is to charge higher gas and water rates outside than inside the borough, when the corporation provide both, and in addition the corporation derives a large revenue from the gas works, and it will probably have a large revenue from a market, and in the case of private Bills I have always read that counsel usually opened his case for a Corporation on a Bill of that kind, by making a case of the great advantage it would be to the township, and the argument was that it would impose no new taxation on the new district, and that it would reduce the rates, and by that means the consent was got, if not of the whole, of a majority or a very large proportion of the district, and I think that is a very fair principle in carrying out Local Government, that the individuals interested should be consulted before being made to give up their separate institutions to another municipal body.

2187. Do you think it makes any difference whether they are formed into a township or are an outlying portion of a city?—It does make a great difference.

2188. Are there not many cases in England under the Local Boards in which they opposed extension, and yet they have been brought in in spite of themselves. They have in England Local Boards, and Sanitary Boards, and School Boards, and so on, and the counsel acting for the different bodies in opposition to the proposed extension, in some cases, were listened to, and in some they were not listened to; in some places these districts were included, and in others they were not included!—There is this important difference between a district that has not been incorporated for municipal purposes, and another that has. One has had no outlay to begin with, on municipal improvements—the Corporation taking over a country district, it will have to provide all these necessary things.

2189. Is it on the question of the outlay afterwards that you lay stress, because I find in a case of St. Leonard and Exeter, this very thing refused to—Yes; Exeter ought to bring them in, and it was contended that it was a great hardship to make them liable to bear the rates, and they opposed on that ground, and eventually a Bill was passed providing that they would be brought in, but that they should not for five years pay increased rates. The same thing was done in the case of the Derby Extension Bill; it was provided that the borough rate should not be increased, nor the School Board rate increased for a certain period in the case of the incoming district.

2190. Dr. Norwood.—When Ballaguer was taken into Rathmines, was not that quid pro quo application of the rule taken into consideration there?—Yes.

2191. CHAIRMAN.—In the case of the Derby Extension Bill there was a rate payable by the people outside; there must have been a borough rate payable by the outside district, but to whom that borough rate was paid I don't know. There they provided that there should be no increase in their taxation for a certain period.

Mr. Walker.—That was in case they should be putting a higher borough rate on the annexed district before a certain period had elapsed.

Fitzsimons.—It is very hard to judge these cases from the report unless you had the evidence. In that district there may have been a majority of the rate-payers in favour of the Bill, and a minority opposed to it. In London I myself have heard the Chairman of the Committee put as his first question—"What is the balance of opinion amongst the rate-payers?" Then is this point also in relation to those townships. If you trace the objects of these Acts of Parliament for creating townships, and what sets parties in motion to get them, you will find that it is usually owners of property, or the inhabitants, or those who wish to speculate in building who promote these Acts, and their object is this—before engaging in this large building speculation they say—"Before we can engage in this successfully, we would like to have the charge of the roads, the lighting, the paving, and everything connected with the building and the approaches to these buildings, vested in our hands. We think it will be a successful speculation on these terms, and might be of doubtful success if it were not so." And there is nothing unexceptional in people coming forward and going to Parliament with that case, and getting an Act of Parliament on that; and then all these building operations and everything else is done for a number of years on the faith of the Act of Parliament. I think it would require a very strong case to disturb all that.

2192. We all know that the metropolitan district of London is increased every year, and that as fast as the building is extended it is included as soon almost as it is done. Is it your opinion that all the legislation for the London metropolis is wrong?—I only speak of townships, and that is the proper meaning of the thing, and it appears to me the equity of the case the requiring the assent of the majority of those interested in the property before they are taken over.

2193. Would you increase the boundary of any township?—On the same terms.

2194. If the outlying district would consent to come in?—Yes; if the people of Terenure saw it to be to their interest to be annexed to Rathmines, and promoted a provisional order for the purpose, I think that Rathmines should be obliged to take them in.

2195. In Waterford, the other day, this strange fact came to our knowledge. There is a street there called Barrack-street. The artillery and cavalry barracks built in that street are outside the city, and the infantry barracks built near them, in the same street, are inside the city bounds. Do you think that there should not be an extension to take in the half of the street not at present within the boundary? The same way in Limerick. There are roads around Limerick, and terraces of houses built on each side of them. The boundary runs through the centre of the road, and the houses on one side of that road are included in the city, and pay city rates, and only get as much advantage as the residents on the other side of the road who are not within the boundary, and, therefore, have not to contribute anything to the rates of the city!—I don't think any one would dispute that a road is not a good boundary. The whole of both sides should be within the boundary.

2196. On what principle should Upper Bagget-street and Upper Lesson-street be in a township, and Lower Bagget-street and Lower Lesson-street in the city?—It should never have been taken out of the city. I think it was a mistake in 1840 to cut that district away from the city. My view of the matter is this, and taking an impartial survey of the question, when the city chooses to throw off a district and say, as the city adds to this district in 1840—"You are not worth keeping, and we will therefore cast you out." And then the district, adopting a municipal system of government, lays out large sums of money in improvements, and they go on improving until at last they become so large

DUBLIN.
April 21, 1873.
Mr John
McEvoy.

that the city at last changes its mind and says—"We now want you." I don't think there is justice in that.

2197. The city says—"Long ago we didn't ask you to come in, because there were no buildings established in your locality, and, therefore you didn't destroy our streets—you didn't dirty or use our streets; therefore we didn't want to be saddled with you at that time. Now you have built up a fine town just outside the city. You come and you use our town, even more largely than the people of the town, and they say you should pay something towards it?"—I repeat that if you want strict justice in reference to the using of the streets, you must revert to the turnpike system.

2198. Do you think there should not be any extension of the boundary of Dublin—I am not now dealing with paving, lighting, and cleansing—matters strictly in connexion with house property—matters that it is the business of those who own or occupy house property to provide for; and, without the consent of the township, I do not think on general grounds of public policy that burdens for these should be transferred, but there are other things for which I think there should be a joint board formed.

2199. With reference to the Vestry Tax, to which you have called attention, are you aware that there has been no Vestry Tax for the last three or four years until this year!—I am.

2200. You know the Collector-General can't be striking a halfpenny rate, or anything of that kind, so he goes for one penny rate, and that one penny rate is put for the purpose of meeting four years together!—I don't see why a halfpenny should not be struck.

2201. There is but £32 to be provided for—a factitious rate would do for that!—I don't mind the halfpenny rate.

2202. A £ ratio would produce over £1,000, which would be more than is wanted!—I am not concerned in that.

2203. You were instances that such a rate should not be levied off the townships!—Quite so; it is greatly in excess of what is wanted in any one year. I was about to point out that there are certain rates that in latter years especially . . .

2204. CHAIRMAN.—You said you would not charge them with any rate for the roads, and you were going on to say that you would have a joint board!—Yes; there are certain duties—it must be remembered that all these townships are constituted, and we are discussing that matter strictly as to local rates—they were constituted for the purpose of paving, lighting, and so on. I think it is, at all events, a very dangerous principle, that property created on the faith of an Act of Parliament should be interfered with, without the consent of the owners. But there are other objects of a common character which the Legislature in its wisdom has latterly imposed upon municipal bodies, which I believe could be carried out better by a joint board and a joint Corporation. The first of these is the charge of the public health. The carrying out of the sanitary code, I think, should be entrusted to a board with large powers, constituted partly of members elected, partly of nominees of the Government, experts; and that that joint board should have making powers, not merely for what is governed by the Corporation, but for the whole police district, Dublin district, and County added, should be under a metropolitan body with large and wide powers, and a striking anomaly would be got rid of in the incidence of taxation, by the creation of such a board. You might share the cost of such a board, and charge the owners and occupiers of property in the urban district, as they are in the rural districts—you might charge them equally with the cost of necessary sanitary measures.

2205. Would you give them power to have a connty district for the purpose of striking a sanitary rate!—The sanitary rate would be struck over the whole district—an equal sanitary rate over the whole district, and should be payable partly by owners, and partly by occupiers.

2206. Would it be your proposal to have an equal sanitary rate over the whole Metropolitan Police District; and would you make a man at Dallymount pay the sanitary rate and contribute to it for Dublin?—Yes, I would.

2207. Like the bridge tax!—Yes; I think it is following up the principle already established in sanitary matters to keep out a plague or epidemic. The Local Government Board is empowered to create what is called a port sanitary authority, and charge its expense over a large district, and I think the principle of that Act of Parliament is applicable to the present case. In—say Rathmines or Dalkey—there is greater danger of an epidemic or disease spreading to it from the Coombe, or some part of Dublin, than there is of the plague from Russia, or some other epidemic from France, and the principle of the one should be, in my opinion, applied to the other, and with this joint board constituted as I suggest—partly of experts—and undertaking real work, a great work of sanitary improvement would be effected over the whole of this united district.

2208. Would you take the sanitary work from the Corporation and the townships, and put it under one local board!—I would. I would have the joint board constituted, as I say, experienced men—men elected partly by owners and partly by occupiers of property—that board should, I think, also take charge of the fire brigade. The fire brigade should be established over the entire of the Metropolitan Police District. In 1872 I had the question under consideration, as far as Kingstown was concerned, being the chairman of the board there at the time, and I went to Captain Shaw of the London Fire Brigade, and asked him his opinion as to how we in Kingstown could best provide a satisfactory and efficient fire brigade. He told me it would be perfectly absurd to think of establishing a fire brigade for a small township like Kingstown. If we were to depend upon local volunteers, upon people who might or might not be able to give us their services at the moment of a fire, the system would break down. We must have men trained in drill daily, or nearly so, under the orders of an officer, and accustomed to obey him, ready and alive to the discharge of their duties at a critical moment when a fire takes place, and to establish such a staff for a small township, would impose on the ratepayers a tax far and away beyond what they should bear. He said that the true system for Dublin—and he knows Dublin well, as an Irishman—was for the Metropolitan District to be formed into one district for fire brigade purposes. The head-quarters should, of course, be in the city. He would have all the stations in the district connected by telegraph, with all their appliances ready at a moment's notice to be sent to any one point in the district that would be in danger. I was so much impressed with the arguments of Captain Shaw, that on my return I recommended the Kingstown Commissioners to adopt that view, and instead of attempting to adopt a little fire brigade that would turn out unsatisfactorily, and to propose to the Corporation an extension of the fire brigade system over the district. In the next year, Sir John Gray, being about to promote a Water Bill, invited a conference here of the chairmen of all the townships. I was one of those who attended that conference, and at it I took the opportunity of suggesting to him to introduce clauses in the Bill to carry out the views of Captain Shaw, and establish such a fire brigade system over the entire district, with a rate limited to 1½d. in the pound, and with a certain representation of the townships on the waterworks committee of the Corporation, or whatever body would have the carrying out of the thing. He heard me, and said he was in favour of the suggestion, but he didn't adopt my view, and the Water Bill brought in by the Corporation the then next year had nothing about it. What I then said I say now—that it is one of the things that should be carried out

DONCASTER.
April 22, 1888.
Mr. John
Mc Gregor.

by a joint board. I don't know as to the water supply. There are contracts between the city and the townships, and I don't know that of a financial scheme, honestly having regard to those contracts, and fixing the rates on the district for them, were prepared. It might be very advisable that the water supply also should be vested in a joint board. The Water Committees are continually at variance with the township on questions of water supply. There is considerable discussion about water in excess of the statutable allowance. There are disputes about the measuring of the water. There are a great many other things that I could notice that lead to the conclusion that it would be very desirable that the whole should be under one management—that the whole system of the water supply of the district should be under one management, having had regard to those bargains made by the Corporation—disavowing as some of them are to the city—but they should be held sacred by the city.

2209. There is a sinking fund of £10,000, and, in point of fact, at the end of twenty-five years the water rate debt will be paid off, and then the citizens of Dublin, supposing nothing occurred, will have their water for nothing!—But I think before that time comes there will be new water works and new expenditure that will put off to still further time—the blindfold time—when the city people will have their water for nothing.

2210. What new waterworks are wanted?—Why, at St. Helier they are about to do something there that will cost a large sum of money. New filter beds will be wanted, and the pipes, I dare say, from time to time will want to be renewed. None can foresee for the future; but it is, I believe, the experience of all cities that have had a water supply for a number of years, that somehow or other the water debt does not materially decrease. They pay off, but they have to get new things totally unforeseen, and I do not therefore look forward to the city water debt being paid off.

2211. Would you not think that, for the better filtration and purification of the water, the township should contribute something?—I think for new works the whole district should contribute something; but all existing contracts should be carried out of the new district, and the joint board should be parties to the new tax.

2212. Would you recognise existing contracts if the purity of the water was increased; or do you contend that they should be at liberty to say, "If you wish to spend money in that way, you may do so, but we will not pay more than our contract rate of 3d. or 4d."?—I propose that they should be represented on the new Board and from their representatives assenting to the new scheme, if they did spend, they should be bound and should bear the expense. There are several other matters that might be carried out by that joint board which I have mentioned. One that has been pressed on my attention has been the carrying out of the Weights and Measures Act. The police district of Dublin is separate from all Ireland under the Weights and Measures Act. Under that Act in all the rest of Ireland the weights and measures system is carried out by the constabulary. In the police district of Dublin the Corporation have the power in their hands within the borough; and the Police Commissioners within the district, outside the borough. The system has not worked well.

2213. Then the constabulary have the power in Clontarf!—Yes; I think it would be very desirable that a municipal body constituted as I have suggested should over the whole of this district carry out the Weights and Measures Act. Everything that could be mentioned about the Fire Brigade system would be equally applicable to the carrying out of an effective weights and measures system by one central authority, instead of each township having its own officials to carry the Act out. There should be a joint system.

2214. Mr. Corlett.—In view of what you have said

as to a joint body, what would you suggest with reference to the boundary of the police district?—I think the police district should be extended to Clontarf—but then comes the question, would the people of Clontarf like to have to pay the police rate?

2215. And how about Drumcondra?—Drumcondra would be the same thing.

2216. Drumcondra is exactly the same distance—the one is inside, and the other is out!—I think Drumcondra should be within the metropolitan district.

2217. For the purposes of this joint Board?—For sanitary purposes.

2218. CHAIRMAN.—Did you consider what has been stated to us—that the artisan classes who work almost daily in Rathmines, Pembroke, and those townships live entirely or almost entirely in the city—that their employers have their establishments in the city—that they go there for their daily orders, and are sent out to work in the suburbs—that they and their families, when sickness falls on them, largely contribute to the expense of the city by using its hospitals, and increasing its poor-law and sanitary expenses? Ought the cost of that altogether to be thrown on the city, in your opinion?—I think that, as far as those charges would come under the poor-law and sanitary systems, Rathmines, &c., should share in the expense.

2219. What would you leave the Corporation to do with a board of this kind?—Would you have the Corporation managing the paving, scavenging, and lighting of their own district and nothing else?—They should continue the management of the city.

2220. What else should they do—they have nothing to do but paving, cleaning, scavenging, and lighting, except the artisans' dwellings!—They have to carry out the grand-jury work of the city.

2221. That after all is only paving, cleaning, and lighting. So far as the public establishments are concerned, they pay their share of the city-at-large charge from time to time, according to the requisitions made on them!—They have the carrying out of the industrial and the reformatory system.

2222. What would you do with regard to this extended district as to carrying that out?—My opinion is that the Government should have taken over these institutions at the same time as they took over the control and management of the prisons.

2223. Is it your proposal, then, that the Corporation should manage the paving, lighting, and cleaning of Dublin, and that each of the townships should do the same thing in their own districts, as at present; and that there should be a metropolitan board extending over the whole of the Police District of Dublin, with Clontarf and Drumcondra added, to carry out all sanitary and fire brigade work, and something else besides?—Yes. I will add, with the view ultimately of that being the joint board for all city purposes, when the consent of the whole district could be obtained to such a measure.

2224. You don't believe you would get the consent of the whole of the people to the abolition of the Corporation, and to have the management under one board?—To have it under one municipal authority.

2225. When is that to be?—When is it likely that will be attained?—I believe it is the only practicable solution of the question. I wish I could agree in the opinion that such a thing is practicable in the present day.

2226. When you talk of the consent of the parties, would you have a poll taken?—What I speak of is this—if the board managing the affairs of the district did so well, and won a complete success, the force of public opinion would gradually be brought round, and would cause the whole of the district to be in favour of union under the one authority, not necessarily this joint board I speak of.

2227. You would have a board partly composed of experts, appointed by the Government. Do you think

Dublin.
April 12, 1871.
Mr. John
McEvoy.

you would be likely to have experts without paying them. You are bringing it very much to the question of a paid metropolitan board—like the Board of Works in London?—One or two might be paid. I am of opinion, that if you want to have these Acts of Parliament carried out effectually, you must have experts on these boards.

2238. If you put experts on these boards, you would hardly get such men as Dr. Cameron and Dr. Mapother, and others of equal eminence. You would hardly get such men, for they wouldn't like to give their time for nothing—it is too valuable to them!—I quite agree with that, but I believe the principle would become popular. At the present time, what I see are our difficulties are these: first, I think you interfere with the rights of property in a very serious way by attempting to abolish these townships and destroy their municipal rights without their consent; in the next place, I don't think, at the present time, we can say that public opinion has advanced sufficiently for the creation of such a municipal authority as I would like to see in Dublin—which might have its power extended over the whole district by an enlightened public, choosing their representatives for their fitness for office, and not for their politics. I would like to be able to say that such a state of things existed, and then would say it should be done; but my experience, unfortunately, is that there is no such state of things existing. You would not have men chosen for their fitness for the positions they were to fill; and it is at a present moment I would throw out this suggestion; looking forward, however, in the hope that it would promote a better state of things, so that the whole of the metropolitan district might be hereafter under one municipal authority, elected by an enlightened and intelligent constituency, and with officers chosen for merit, and merit only, to carry on the affairs of the municipality.

2239. It appears from the Government return, that in the township of Rathmines last year, there was expended £45 on sanitary matters. In the last audited accounts last year, it is stated and passed by the auditor, Mr. Calleite—all that he passed as the Rathmines expenditure on sanitary matters was £45!—I do not think that that is a proper amount of expenditure for sanitary purposes; but I don't think that I am obliged to make any observation on that, because I propose taking the charge of the sanitary matters from them.

2240. I suppose you know the recommendation of the Committee under which the Commission to us was issued. You read that!—I did.

2241. Did you also read the report that was prepared by Mr. Butt, and which was lost by the casting vote of the chairman!—I read that report, too.

2242. There appears to have been a strong feeling on both sides of the Committee of the House of Commons. [The Chairman then read Mr. Butt's clause with regard to this—that a change in the boundary is desirable in almost all the corporate towns, &c.] It would occur to me that when that was voted for by eight members of the Committee, it would go to show that the opinion of those eight members, after the Commission had visited all the towns, was, that it was right to increase the boundaries—no matter whether these were existing townships or not!—As well as I recollect, the struggle was about the Household Suffrage principle and the opposite principle. Mr. Butt wanted to have the franchise a household suffrage one.

2243. There were two principles. The first was, whether the areas were to be increased, whether a thousand, or so on. The two recommendations were these. One was prepared and proposed by Sir Michael Hicks-Bass. [The Chairman then read a further extract from the report, recommending that a committee be appointed for the purpose of inquiring as to the extent of the alteration of the municipal boundaries, in all towns where municipal bodies exist]. In saying that, is it your opinion that it is not right that there

should be this interference with vested interests—for we have the opinion of the members of that Committee of the House of Commons that it was desirable that there should be an extension?—They may have contemplated an extension different to what is now proposed.

2244. It was upon the question of the area of the municipal boundary of Dublin I was speaking. In Galway the boundaries extend out three or four miles, and the municipal boundaries in Cork are very peculiar, and our warrant is to see whether such boundaries cannot be limited, extended, or otherwise altered!—Supposing a large portion of that agricultural district of Galway was struck out, as Pembroke was in 1840, and left to its own people and their resources, and the owners of property got it formed into a township, and got builders and others to invest their money, on the faith of the Act of Parliament, in building, and laying out large sums of money on buildings, and that then, in the course of time, Galway changed its mind.

2245. Then I suppose they would go in for an extension, and then the Legislature would say we have the precedent of that Committee of 1873, and a Committee would issue!—What I say is, that a dangerous interference with property and a state of insecurity would be caused, and it is a much greater evil than could be compensated for by any twopenny or threepenny saving in rates that would be effected here or there.

2246. But there you have Committees of the House of Commons, and they appear to have taken a unanimous view that extension was desirable!—Oh, the real fight was over the household suffrage question.

2247. Is there anything else you wish to add to your evidence?—I would only observe that some evidence was given comparing the debts of Dublin and some of the English boroughs. Such comparisons are fallacious in this respect, that in most of these English towns the corporations have got over the gas works, and that of course creates a debt. They have got a water debt for supplying the water to the outlying districts, and if Dublin supplied the outlying districts in the same way, the water debt would be probably £100,000 more than it is.

2248. The Corporation of Dublin supplies Beauchamp and all the townships around!—What I mean is this, that it is unfair to compare Dublin that has not had down roads in these districts, and has not incurred a debt in consequence. I say it is unfair to compare it with towns like Manchester and other towns that have done that. Then there are market debts, great debts on public parks, debts on free libraries, baths, and workhouses, townhalls, courts, and stations, because they have got charge of the police in the English towns, and a good many of those debts are incurred for police purposes. Then they have a great many wide street improvements. Now, if these cases are cited, it would be well to show that although our debt is comparatively light, there is very little to show for it; I think that this should be known. The debt of Dublin has mounted from £635,000, exclusive of the debt due to the Government on account of the city prisons—that is not given in the Corporation returns—exclusive of that the debt has grown from £635,000 in 1875, until we have a debt charged on the rates last year of £668,049.

2249. How is that—because it is only given to us as £640,000 and some few pounds!—Here it is. The total is given here of page 223 as £668,049, and the debt on the city estate as £18,804. The entire debt on the 3rd of April was £650,834 13s. 10d. This debt was reduced from £666,834 13s. 10d. which it was on the 31st of August to £650,012. It was reduced by £16,000 or £17,000 since the 31st of August last, though I don't know but that they have incurred new debts.

2250. Mr. Beveridge says that they have not incurred a funding grant. You speak to show that the management of the townships should be left as they are at present, and I am not saying how it may turn out to be, but I know you have a different opinion

DUBLIN
April 11, 1879.
Mr. John
McGeary.

with regard to the carrying out of the provisions of the Public Health Act, that is to have a disinfecting apparatus, because I recall your views in connexion with that. It is stated that in Bathmores there is nothing of the kind, and that in point of fact the provisions of the Public Health Act have not been carried out—it is not to be expected that every small township should have these disinfecting chambers.

2243. It is not to be expected! But the Act of Parliament says they shall. The Act of Parliament says that they should do all these things—should have a morgue, and so on!—There is nothing more absurd than the provisions of some of these Acts with regard to what these townships should have. Every township should have an inspector of gas meters, an inspector of food, a consulting sanitary officer, a resident sanitary officer, and an executive sanitary officer, and an inspector of weights and measures.

2244. The Legislature enacted that they should have all these things, and that they should do all these things, and you know perfectly well that you have complained that they did not do what the Legislature said they should do!—The Legislature made a very absurd enactment in holding that such offices should be kept up in all towns irrespective of their circumstances.

2245. Do you think that in such a place as Dublin, with all these townships added, that each of these offices should be kept up?—That is my argument. I do not think the Act will ever be carried out properly until it is done by a joint board.

2246. Do you think that the Board you talk of would do it efficiently? I suppose as regards the construction of that board you would not want more than the number of the Corporation!—I think the Corporation might be very well reduced in numbers. They would still have their city estate; they would have their mansion house, their bells and banquets, and all those things just as now.

2247. You have heard it calculated that the valuation of the city estate is about £700,000, and the Corporation propose to bring in these townships, and make them slaves in the advantage of the city estate—do you think that would be an advantage?—I would be delighted if the townships would make a bargain with the Corporation, in the first place for the better management of the city estate for the common benefit of all, then that the city property should be dealt with by such a court as the Landed Estates Court for the better management of its interests; then that the townships should be satisfied with the government of the Corporation as reformed, and then that the townships should agree voluntarily to be joined with the city. I should be delighted if all that were so.

2248. Supposing one-half of the people were of one mind, and the other half of an opposite opinion—for instance, a memorial has come in from some of the ratepayers of Clontarf asking to be annexed, and the Commissioners of Clontarf have sent in a memorial asking not to be annexed—how would you ascertain what was the preponderating opinion?—I would decide by a majority. I should say that the Town Commissioners should submit to the decision of the majority of the ratepayers.

2249. Then comes the question of what is a clear majority?—A majority—it may be of one.

Examined by Mr. Heron.

2250. You have paid great attention to what I may term the properly adjusted and scientific incidence of local taxation!—I cannot say that I have studied the science, but I have studied it practically.

2251. You have made a valuable suggestion about doing complete justice to the roadways of Dublin—mainly by the turnpikes!—I did not suggest that. I say that is the only way if you want to measure what every man should pay for the use of the roads. I do not see how you could do it otherwise.

2252. What you propose is that the people coming in from Pembroke should pay at the turnpikes!—I

don't say that; but it is the only way to do it, but I think it is an absurdity.

2253. But you say it is the only way justice can be done—I don't see why the citizens of Dublin should charge people coming in to do business in the city when they have not to pay for the use of the roads leading to Dublin.

2254. Do you consider a man having a place of business in the Commercial Buildings a citizen of Dublin?—I do.

2255. And that he should bear some of the taxes of Dublin!—Of course he should—any man that has property—in connexion with his property.

2256. Would you say that, even though he was not paying rates, he might be making £10,000 a year in the city, and not paying rates? take, for instance, the whole of the Commercial Buildings!—That, perhaps, raises another question—whether the city taxation—taxation for municipal purposes—should be wholly cast upon owners of house property and not on owners of other property. I think there is a great deal to be said against it, and that others should pay a share of the municipal taxation.

2257. What do you say to families sending in their children to school and going themselves to the theatres and other places of amusement, and using the roads of the city for that purpose?—The people they pay money to for all those purposes should pay those rates for that purpose.

2258. Do you think that the persons in the Commercial Buildings should not pay?—Yes; supposing a man has only an office, he has to pay rates on that office in his rent.

2259. CHAIRMAN.—I have it on the evidence of Mr. Stokes that every single person who had an office there had not to pay rates, and that he remained in order that there might be no question raised!—Whoever lets the office to the merchant, must calculate the rates he has to pay, and charges accordingly in the rent for them.

2260. MR. HERON.—Do you mean to say that the rating of the Commercial Buildings bears any proportion at all to the amount paid by the persons who have offices in it to the owner?—I think it is rated at £500; that is a large sum.

2261. Now, take for instance the case of Leinster Chambers, 43, Dame-street, that has a valuation of £143.

2262. CHAIRMAN.—I think we counted sixteen different people who had chambers in that building. All these persons are doing business there in separate sets of chambers, and not one of them are rated. Do you think that the rates paid by the owner on a valuation of £143 in any way fairly represent what the owners ought to get from the persons using these offices—many of them solicitors, who have papers, deeds, and other valuable documents—persons for whom the fire brigade would be a benefit!—I think that is a case for a revaluation. Every one of those places ought to be valued, and every one of these merchants ought to be rated.

MR. HERON.—And you think every merchant should bear his fair share of the city burden!—He ought.

2263. As regards the Commercial Buildings—they are rated at £500!—Yes; I think so; something about that.

2264. And the Chamber of Commerce pays £500 also!—I don't know.

2265. At present they pay no rates at all!—I don't know. I myself pointed out to the Parliamentary Committee that these people are neither rated, nor do they enjoy the franchise. They should have both. They should be rated, and have votes for these offices.

2266. How could they be rated?—Each of these offices should be separately valued.

2267. CHAIRMAN.—How could you carry that out without a change in the law, and have it enacted that portions of tenements should be rated?—I would note

DUBLIN,
April 1st, 1878.

Mr. John
McEvoy.

separate portions. I think it is the law that they should be taxed.

2266. You think it is the law?—Yes; where they have a separate tenement.

2267. There was a great struggle in Trinity College about getting them on. We all know that it is as one office that the Chamber of Commerce is rated, and we know that in the case of the Leinster Chambers the whole house is rated as if occupied by one person; we all know that it is let out in numbers of rooms, and that there are sixteen occupiers. On what principle would you rate them?—would you rate each room separately, and make each party pay separately?—I would rate each one separately on the value of the office.

2268. And you would do that because you think the occupier should pay something for the roads of Dublin?—He should pay his share of the city taxes.

2269. As regards the turnpikes, would you apply that system to the Rock-road?—I would not apply it anywhere.

2270. Why do you suggest it? When I was asked the question, "Do the people outside not use the roads of the city, and is there not therefore a just claim on them for the repair of the roads?"—I said, "If you want to measure every man's share of the expense of the roads, you can only do it by the turnpike system."

2271. How many would you say on the Rock-road?—I don't know how many—you would want a good many.

Examined by Mr. Waller.

2272. Do you think, when speaking of bringing us into one common family, that the management of the Corporation revenues and income during the last, say ten years, has been satisfactory, economical or advantageous to the citizens?—Well, I think not. I have taken part in opposing a good many of their schemes of expenditure as wasteful in my opinion.

2273. Has it been wasteful?—Yes—wasteful and negligent.

2274. You know the feeling in Dublin on this subject?—There is a strong feeling on the subject.

2275. Is there a strong feeling existing in the city of Dublin against the management of the Corporation revenues by the Corporation?—There is a strong feeling in Dublin amongst the influential classes that they would be very glad to see the Corporation abolished, and paid Commissioners appointed in their place.

2276. Do you think it very reasonable that Bath-mines and Pembroke and Clerkenwell should pay for the expenses of the Mansion House, and especially if they increase?—The Mansion House expenses are all paid out of the city estate.

2277. Have those expenses increased?—They have increased from the time the late Mr. Guinness was Lord Mayor, in 1851 or 1852. They were then about £100 a year, and they came up in 1857 to £3,500. They have decreased last year—since the borough rate was quashed they have decreased.

2278. Do you think that the improvement rate raised by the Corporation has been judiciously managed and expended by them?—Well, indeed, as compared with the old Paving Commissioners, I don't think their management compares equally well.

2279. Not since the time of the late Paving Commissioners?—Not since then.

2280. Is it your experience, knowing the feelings of a great number of citizens, that the administration of affairs by the Corporation is conducted solely with the desire of managing the affairs of the city properly; or does the debating element largely prevail?—I think there are some men who go into the Corporation to make it a stepping-stone to Parliament, and necessarily they must devote their attention to political affairs, and prove themselves champions for something or other in order to qualify themselves for seats in Parliament.

2281. Just something like what we hear about local government and household suffrage?—Yes.

2282. From your knowledge of Dublin is there or

is there not a confidence existing in the management of the city and its revenues and its taxes by the Corporation?—There is a great want of confidence.

2283. CHAIRMAN.—You spoke just now of the Paving Board; surely were not the funds of the Paving Board much less than the funds of the present Corporation for keeping up the streets and seeing to the traffic—infinitely less during the days of their management than they are at present?—You have, in the appendix to the report of the Select Committee, of 1876, the income and expenditure of the Paving Board for a number of years, and my recollection is that their income was less.

2284. Because the valuation of the city at that time was much higher than that now?—The funds were fixed independently of the valuation. They had a certain sum which they received and expended.

2285. Since then they have borrowed £50,000 for paving the streets, and don't you think there has been a great improvement?—Yes, but that improvement should have been done long ago.

2286. When you said just now that there was a want of confidence in the Corporation, is it not because people are in the habit of saying that the Corporation are practically insolvent?—I don't think any one says that.

2287. Is not that feeling of insecurity caused by the belief that they owe more money than they are able to pay?—Public opinion in the city, as far as I know it is that they don't manage the affairs of the city in such a way as to secure the confidence of the intelligent portion of the newspapermen. If you take the works of the city of Dublin and compare them with Birmingham I don't think you will regard the comparison as a satisfactory one for Dublin, if you take up every item.

2288. Can Birmingham boast a better water supply?—It cannot.

2289. A better fire brigade?—I think not.

2290. With regard to the sanitary arrangements, I suppose Birmingham is much better?—The sanitary arrangements of Birmingham are much better. I may mention that I happened to be in Birmingham on Saturday of last week, and I was anxious to see how they carried out their sanitary work and their street improvement scheme. I got a lot of information from their officials. I asked one of the officials to bring me to see a really bad part of the city—the worst part of the unhealthy area which they were about to demolish. I went with him and got a great deal of information as to what they had been able to do there in courts and lanes, &c., and I found that the streets in this unhealthy area were better streets and better scavenged than some of the best streets in Dublin. That was my observation. In Birmingham, too, you have a great market yielding a large income, and besides you have a public library, public parks, and so on.

2291. They have not failed to borrow largely on the city estate?—There is no city estate.

2292. They have not failed to borrow largely on their city rates to get money for these great public benefits of a great public market, theatre, public library, and so forth; and to buy up the gas works because the debt of Birmingham is something like £2,811,824. You see there is a great difference between that and £832,000!—To compare that debt with Dublin you must take off what would be the debt they may have incurred for their market, for their free library, for their public parks, for their Town Hall—and a magnificent new town hall they are building—and for the gas a very considerable item; and then the cost of laying down the mains outside, for Birmingham has recently got over from the water companies their powers, and these water companies supplied districts far out of Birmingham. If you exclude all these items in your comparison I think you will see how fallacious it is.

2293. Mr. Horne.—I am told the debt is nearly £6,000,000!—You may include £2,800,000 for the gas, I think.

2294. Mr. O'Donnell.—The total amount of money borrowed by Birmingham, and due from loans, an

DUBLIN.

April 15, 1879.

Mr. John
McEvoy.

the 31st December, 1877, was something short of £6,000,000, but that included £3,000,000 for gas.

2295. Mr. McEvoy.—The gas undertaking in Birmingham extends far beyond the boundary of the borough.

2296. Mr. Heron.—Have you yourself tried to get into the Corporation of Dublin?—I have been a candidate several times.

2297. That was for the purpose of making everything right?—Yes.

2298. Is it not your sincere opinion that if you get in there would not be a single thing to find fault with in the Corporation?—I am quite sure there would be half a dozen, at least.

The inquiry was then adjourned to Tuesday, April 16th.

April 15, 1879.

DUBLIN.—SIXTH DAY.—APRIL 15TH, 1879.

2299. The CHAIRMAN.—There is one matter I wanted to call your attention to, Mr. Heron. The Corporation have not given us any evidence whatever with regard to Kilmashan. They have not given us any reason, any statistics or figures, or, in point of fact, any information such as we have had concerning Rathmines and Pembroke. We have not been told what it consists of, whether it is portion of a continuous line of streets, or why, in fact, it should be fairly brought in.

Mr. J. P. BYRNE, &c., re-examined by Mr. Heron.

Mr. J. P.
Byrne, &c.

2301. Have you prepared a table in reference to the old wards and the new additions, and especially with regard to Kilmainham?

Mr. Byrne.—The question has been fully under the consideration of the committee, and we found that Kilmainham, amongst other townships, joined the city boundary.

2302. Mr. Crotty.—Was this at the meeting of Saturday?

2303. Mr. Byrne.—No, at the meeting where we went into the subject and framed the reply to the question. Although we did not specially refer to Kilmainham by name, those were the chief grounds why we proposed to include it. Kilmainham joins the city the same as the other townships, and we see no reason for not taking Kilmainham in on that principle. Also, Kilmainham is a district, not of very large population although a large area, and not of large value, and we decided to add it in order to complete the whole area of the city under the same principle.

2304. CHAIRMAN.—What is the valuation?—The valuation is £8,633, and the area 636.0s. 3d. 3s., and the population 4,855.

2305. Now, are the Richmond Barracks, the Islandbridge Barracks, and all these buildings around them included in Kilmainham?—Yes.

Mr. Andrews.—They won't pay anything even if annexed.

We ourselves may have a local knowledge, of course, of all this, but it is nevertheless right we should have some evidence on the point, and, in fact, some reason why the Corporation wish to take it over.

Mr. Heron.—Mr. Byrne has a table prepared on the point, and I will examine him.

2306. CHAIRMAN.—Any report we make must be given, based on evidence.

2307. CHAIRMAN.—The Government now pay by way of contribution, and yet get that, but they pay nothing towards the lighting of the city.

2308. Mr. Heron.—Is Kilmainham a district entirely of a city character?—Yes, it has entirely a city character. The people have business occupations all round it, and it is, so far as character is concerned, part and parcel of the city.

2309. The main line runs through Kilmainham?—Yes.

2310. The court-house is in Kilmainham?—Yes; it is on the boundary of the city.

2311. And are the Inchicore works in Kilmainham?—Yes.

2312. Kilmainham is supplied with Vartry water?—Yes.

2313. Mr. Andrews.—The Inchicore works save the city an enormous amount of money.

Mr. Byrne.—Kilmainham is a township abutting on the boundary, with an arbitrary line between, half undefined.

2314. Mr. Heron.—So as to include it in the adjoining ward. What is the valuation of the ward?

Mr. Byrne.—Mr. Eskin asked me to make a short return with regard to these wards, and I have done it here, showing the fifteen wards as they exist at present, except so far as relates to the additions I mention.—

State of Ward.	Area.	Valuation.	Population.	Area.	Valuation.	Population.
Anglesey Ward,	—	£		—	£	
Add Grangegorman,	567	22,998	26,393	562	37,068	—
	535	4,870	—			
Usher's-quay Ward,	591	22,762	22,637	532	41,615	22,563
Add Rathmines,	536	5,665	4,950	532		
East's-quay Ward,	—	—	—	533	24,316	21,069
Hanover	—	—	—	538	33,400	18,487
New City	—	—	—	539	40,943	11,327
North Dock	—	—	—	533	47,455	23,263
Botanic	—	—	—	536	28,541	9,345
Fitzwilliam	—	—	—	503	45,546	9,386
Marnion House	—	—	—	535	33,976	13,734
Merchant's-quay	—	—	—	534	25,626	20,578
Royal Exchange	—	—	—	77	81,595	11,785
South City	—	—	—	55	40,912	7,985
South Dock	—	—	—	593	45,750	14,496
Triinity	—	—	—	168	40,972	14,908
Wood-quay	—	—	—	158	27,651	21,628

The valuation and population of Kilmainham were very small, and the area did not form the sole element in inducing us to include it; adding Kilmainham and Usher's-quay would bring it to about 1,127 acres; yet the valuation is not more than the fifth or sixth

highest in the valuations of the other fourteen wards, and the population would be something in excess, but not very much. We propose to leave the other thirteen wards unchanged, as shown in the return. That was my opinion as to the wards; having regard also

to the fact that if we reduced one of the representatives from each of the wards, it would leave us fifteen to give to the other five additional wards. That would leave the number of the Council sixty as at present; and I think that would be found to work satisfactorily. The changes we propose in the other wards—the other five wards were—Pembroke township, to be divided into two wards, the western ward in it to include Milltown and Roebuck division, west of Stillorgan-road; east ward to contain remainder of Pembroke. The boundary between east and west wards commences at McKeown's bridge over the Grand Canal, along Northumberland-road and Pembroke-road, to Bell's bridge, thence along Simmon's-court to Dounybrook-bridge, and thence southward through centre of Dounybrook and Stillorgan-road to Foster-avenue.

2314. Mr. CORRIGAN.—When you talk of the Pembroke township, you include the yellow district—the portion marked yellow south of it!—Yes, including Milltown and Roebuck division.

2315. That is nearly as large as Pembroke!—It is not equal to it in valuation or population.

2316. CHAIRMAN.—You have told us what you would consider a fair division of Pembroke!—Yes.

2317. Mr. HERON.—We are preparing a map of what we may call New Dublin.

2318. Mr. BYRNE.—I may, going back for a moment to the wards of the city, mention that Wood-quay Ward and Merchant's-quay Ward have the lowest valuation, but nearly approach the highest area and population. The North City, South City, and Royal Exchange Wards, with the smallest area, are amongst the highest in valuation. The South City, Rotunda, and Friarwilliam, with smallest population, are amongst the highest in value, and consequently the individual rating is in excess of other wards. There has not been any expression of dissent at the existing formation of the wards. The representatives do not appear to exercise any special influence on behalf of their own wards; the present arrangements appear to have worked well, and therefore it might not be prudent to make changes that might create elements of discord. The way it has been suggested, therefore, to arrange the wards is to allow the fifteen existing wards to remain as they are, except as follows:—Giangogorman, containing 303a. 3m. 15s., and valuation £4,870 10s., to be added to Arans-quay Ward; Dolphin's-Island, with 128a. 3m. 38s., and valuation £971, and Terenure, containing 243a. 2m. 11s., and valuation £4,415 10s., to be added to Western Ward of Rathmines; see East Ward in Rathmines for remainder. The boundary between East and West Ward commences at Portobello-bridge, and runs through centre of Rathmines-road, thence through centre of Rathgar-road and Owell-road to the bridge over the Dodder. That applied to us to be a marked division that might suit.

2319. CHAIRMAN.—Could you tell us as you propose to take in portion of Terenure, how much the Corporation propose to add to Rathmines of the district sought to be embodied into the township in the private Bill introduced the other day!—No, I don't happen to know.

2320. Could you tell us how much of what was proposed to be formed or brought in under that new measure is proposed to be brought in by the Corporation!—No. I am not aware.

2321. Mr. ANDREWS.—Could you favour us with the return of your figures of valuation, area, &c., of the proposed arrangement of wards, it would greatly facilitate us.

Mr. BYRNE.—Certainly. A map is to be prepared in accordance with this statement.

2322. CHAIRMAN.—Now, Mr. BYRNE, with reference to Kilmainham is it your opinion that the people use Kilmainham as much in proportion to the population as they do Pembroke or Rathmines!—Quite so. I would imagine it is indispensable.

2323. And they draw their coal, &c., through the city to it!—Yes.

2324. Mr. CORRIGAN.—What is the total population of Kilmainham?—4,956.

2325. Have you separated that in any way into barracks, railway employees, or other residents!—No, I have not.

2326. Dr. NORSESS quoted from the "Redundant and Vacant Township Bill," 7th section, the definition of the boundary proposed there, commencing—

"A boundary line commencing in the centre of the river Dodder, in the townland of Newcastle Little, parish of Rathfarnham, at a point where the extreme northern angle of boundary between the said townland of Newcastle Little, parish of Rathfarnham, and the western angle of the townland of Rathmaine Little, parish of Terenure, meet in said river Dodder; thence as an octoed, westerly, and westerly direction along the boundary between the said townlands of Newcastle Little and Rathmaine Little to its point of junction, with the public roads, &c."

2327. CHAIRMAN.—What rate do the Great Southern and Western Railway Company pay you!—On their buildings they pay to the full value—it is only the ground under the rails that is rated at one-fourth. The Quarter Sessions are held for all the townships in Kilmainham.

2328. Mr. BESWICK, Town Clerk.—I gave you on Saturday morning the presentations for prisons made in Michaelmas, 1877. These were exceptionally low, because the Prison Act received the Royal assent in August—the 14th of August, 1877. Under the 17th section, the prisons were to be transferred to the General Prisons Board, and so since 1878 the Board, appointed under that Act, have to provide for the persons expenses, unless and excepting the sums in respect of superannuation of prison officers, which must be paid out of the Grand Jury fund, and besides that under arrangement with the Government, tools, materials, &c., in stock, will be given credit for to the Corporation. Under the Act 40 & 41 Vict., c. 49, the expenses of the city prisons will in future be defrayed out of moneys to be provided by Parliament. The presentations for Michaelmas, 1877, would really give no idea of what they had been for the past three years or so. In 1874 the amount required to maintain the city prisons was £18,926 0s. 5d.; in 1875, £13,908 1s. 8d.; in 1876, £15,767 7s. 3d.; and the average of these three years, and taking them to be average years, was £15,903 0s. 9d. The present charge for pensions is less than £3,000.

2329. CHAIRMAN.—So that the city is relieved by the Prison Act of £12,000 or £13,000 a year!—Yes, and eventually it will be relieved to the extent of £1,600 when the pensions die out.

2330. CHAIRMAN.—That is as to the city. How do the townships stand with regard to their contribution towards the prisons!—I do not know.

2331. You don't know by how much have they been relieved!—No, I do not.

2332. They might be relieved equally, and the difference, if any in the relief, will become a question for consideration in any scheme of amalgamation!—Yes; the Grand Jury fund is permanently relieved of a great charge.

2333. CHAIRMAN.—Between £12,000 and £13,000 a year.

2334. Mr. BESWICK.—Then with regard to the exceptional item of £21,000, which was taken into account in financing all the presentations, that arose when the city accountant and I were considering the schedule of presentations. He found that owing to slight increase in valuation, spread over several years, the assessment had realized more than was necessary to discharge the presentations, and this excess, although actually not in hand, we knew would be realized, and advised the committee to take it into account. I have the full statement here. It is the printed statement on which the Finance and Lease Committee acted, and shows a total estimated excess of £21,308 1s. 3d. I think I had better put in the whole statement as it stands.

EVIDENCE,
April 15, 1878.
Mr. J. P.
Byrne, Esq.

DUBLIN,
April 14, 1878.
Mr J. P.
Byrne, Esq.

The Town Clerk read and handed in the following return of the Grand Jury fund for 1878 (October 17th).

	Cash to Credit in Bank of Ireland, as per Bank Pass Book, on 17th October, 1878.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Outstanding Cheques, chargeable against same,					103	5	0
Leasing available,							9,907 1 6
Amount due by Water Works Fund, on account of advances,							3,903 1 10
Amount advanced to City Treasurer to pay witness,							1,054 14 8
Amount to be refunded by Board of Superintendence and by the Government,							5,635 7 8
Amount presented in 1875 for 1876,					54,154	5	8
Cash lodged by Collector-General including Government contribution,					53,982	12	9
							297 11 11

Estimated value of outstanding arrears, 1876,							159 0 0
Amount presented in 1876 for 1877,							40,121 13 0
Cash lodged by Collector-General of Rates, including Government contribution, one quarter,							82,110 7 3
							28,011 5 9

Estimated value of outstanding arrears, 1877,							5,200 0 0
Amount presented in 1877 for 1878,							38,917 1 8
Cash lodged by Collector-General of Rates,							26,360 12 2
							23,556 9 6

Estimated value of outstanding Rate for 1878,							17,000 0 0
Amount of undischarged Presentments on 17th October, 1878,							34,526 5 2
							15,817 3 11
TOTAL ESTIMATED EXCESS,							421,300 1 3

2335. You thought it unnecessary to strike the 6d. rate this year!—Yes, for the reasons I have already stated. The Present Act relieved the city of a charge of £13,000 a year, and then the amount received as contribution from the Government for the support of lunatics had become so much larger.

2336. How was it you said the other day, as I understood you, that probably there would have been an increase of 6d. in the pound!—The reason I said I thought it would be 6d. more in the pound was, on account of this exceptional item of £2,000 we gave credit for, and which we won't take credit for afterwards.

2337. As things stand at present what is the entire amount you will have to pay towards what are called county at large charges!—The city accountant is engaged making a calculation showing—assuming all the temporary charges were exhausted—what the permanent Grand Jury rate would be for hospitals, contributions to the lunatic asylums, industrial schools, and so on.

2338. CHAIRMAN.—That is what we want to know. What the Grand Jury rate ought to be. Now, it was stated the other day that the Corporation wanted to borrow another £100,000 for paving. Is it considered that that would do enough of work in the present city!—Oh! no, it will cause a very great saving. The thoroughfares now laid down with Macadam, and most expensive to repair will be looked after. If the Commissioners desire we can put in a table a calculation showing the expense of maintaining William-street during the past year. Once these thoroughfares urgently calling for improvement are finished, the city engineer has suggested that a further loan be obtained.

2339. After the £100,000!—Yes.

2340. Then to make the present city perfect after the £50,000 that has been obtained, has been expended, how much is it contemplated will be required!—The £50,000 has been expended.

2341. Well put aside that and how much will be required in addition!—The city engineer contemplates £150,000, in addition to the £100,000.

2342. That is £250,000 in all!—Yes.

2343. Has the city engineer calculated what would be, in addition to that (if anything), necessary to lay out on Rathmines and Pembroke for the purpose of

giving them permanently good roads when they would be brought in and added to the city!—There is no doubt a large amount of money would have to be laid out on footways to put them in order in Rathmines. The engineer has not suggested what the amount would be, and in the main thoroughfare the paving should be completed on both sides of the tram line.

2344. CHAIRMAN.—That would be a very important thing for us to know by the time we sit here again. What Mr. Neville considers, supposing the townships are brought in, it would cost to give them good paved roads, and place them in fact on the same footing as Dublin; for if you take them in and charge them, you must treat them as well as you do the citizens of Dublin. A careful calculation of that should be made; first, what the cost is for Dublin—what would be required to place it in a perfect state of repair—you say £150,000; secondly, what would be the cost of doing equally well with Dublin the roads of all the townships you propose bringing in to Dublin!—The city engineer has laid it down as one of the principles of paving, that as the tram lines are laid through all the great arteries and from the city, the paving of all these roads and streets ought to be completed. There are other matters too that require to be looked to. In Rathmines—I don't know so much about the rest—there is room for improvement of the public lamps—the antiquated lamps ought to be changed for proper modern lanterns.

2345. If you want, and if you propose, to borrow £250,000 for Dublin, all these townships will want £150,000—that will be £400,000 at least to be borrowed on the credit of the rates of the entire area. That is a large sum in addition to what you think is required for carrying out the main drainage scheme!—Yes; that in addition to their debts would nearly exhaust all their borrowing powers on their present valuation.

2346. CHAIRMAN.—It would be a serious thing for a township who say, "We are satisfied with the roads at present, and they are quite good enough for our traffic, and are we to be made to pay for your roads." What do you propose on this point?

2347. Mr. Heron.—I would suggest that Mr. Neville make a survey and estimate for Rathmines. It will require an enormous outlay.

Mr. J. P. Byrne.—With reference to the borrowing

of the sum of £350,000 more, I may mention as a not unimportant consideration that we calculated that borrowing that money at 4 per cent. would be about £10,000 a year interest; well, the present amount expended on macadamising £13,000 a year, and upon scavenging £13,000 a year, that is £36,000 a year; and having regard to the experiment we tried in reference to William-street, we find the expense of scavenging and keeping clean in a perfect manner William-street was about one-tenth of the ordinary expenses of macadamising the ordinary streets; well, the tenth of

£36,000 would be £3,600, so that it would only cost £2,500 for what we now pay £23,000; so that there would in point of fact be a saving of 50 per cent. on the whole.

2348. MR. COTTON.—Would not the same argument apply to the township roads?—Yes; the entire expense of the macadamising is £35,000, and about one-tenth of that would be expended if we had the streets paved.

[No other witness attended, and the inquiry was adjourned until the 19th of May.]

DUBLIN.
April 16, 1879.
MR. J. P.
Byrne, Esq.

DUBLIN—SEVENTH DAY—MAY 19TH, 1879.

May 19, 1879.

The Inquiry was resumed to-day (Monday, 19 May, 1879), in the City Hall.

By Mr. EXHAN, Q.C. (Chairman), and Mr. C. P. COTTON, Q.C.

Mr. Walker, Q.C., proceeded to open the case proposed to be made against the extension.

2349. CHAIRMAN.—I think, Mr. Walker, it might be better perhaps if you confined yourself to discussing the question of the Corporation seeking to include you, for another question may arise quite distinct as to the amalgamation of the Pembroke and Rathmines Townships, or the Terenure district.

2350. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—I am aware that the feeling of Rathmines and Pembroke is, that neither would like to be annexed to Dublin, nor to be amalgamated with each other. I think, therefore, it would be a waste of time were I not to go into the whole case now.

2351. Mr. COTTON.—Some of the Terenure people may wish to come into Rathmines—will you discuss that question now?

2352. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—I thought that after this inquiry into the Municipal Boundaries of Dublin, you would hold formal meetings in the townships—but that they would be only formal meetings. There is no desire to be amalgamated, no more than to be annexed, and it is better I should go into the entire case.

2353. CHAIRMAN.—You may find that some of the Terenure people, and others, will want to be brought into you.

2354. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—If I were only to deal with the case of the Corporation, you would only hear one side. It is better that you should hear the opposition as well—better to hear the case fully discussed. Well now, sir, on the part of the Rathmines township, whose opposition I open now because it is the oldest and most important of these suburban institutions, and at any rate as large as any—it will be my duty very shortly to call your attention to the principle upon which, I think, hedges lie this ought not to be annexed. The case that has been made by the Corporation is now over, and the arguments that may be presented to you on behalf of the Rathmines township, will, to some extent, no doubt, embrace arguments that may be addressed to you on behalf of other townships. It is very much a common cause. I represent also the township of Drumcondra—a township, the name of which has hardly been mentioned since this inquiry began, except in connexion with the line constituting the Metropolitan Police district, and I was not fortunate enough to hear any observation from any witness, saying it would be well to annex the Drumcondra district, except to make the "scientific frontier," the map discloses. Of course, it now appears that your inquiry is being held, with what we may call a warrant of a most comprehensive character—on the one hand, it is alleged that there should be an extension; on the other, there is a denial that the boundaries of Dublin required extension; and the second portion of your warrant deals with the important and comprehensive subject of taxation, and the terms upon which, (if any), annexation should be made—terms which you will remember were first suggested in the course of this inquiry, after we had

met, and by a series of coaxing questions from the Commissioners—from one or both of the Commissioners—which led them (though it was difficult to grasp it) to, in some sense, see what case was being presented. Now, it is not very material to call attention to any witness examined on behalf of the Corporation. They examined in point of fact, six officers, I think; in fact, every officer under the control of that body—five members of the Town Council, and also what we may call two independent witnesses. And I need not mention that one of these independent witnesses differed entirely and widely from the members of the Corporation who gave evidence before you, for his evidence proceeded on this, that the vested interests of the township which had been created and allowed to remain and exist in them by statute after statute, and by the passive action, at the inflictional action of the Corporation, should be held sacred by you—I need not refer to the evidence of Mr. McEvoy, for he was diametrically opposed to any extension, and this case stands in the singular position of being put forward and completed without one person outside the Town Council or their servants having come here to speak in favour of annexation on the terms that, as I gather from the evidence, it is their wish to annex. It is not unworthy of remark that though the citizens were over and over again invited to come forward as independent witnesses to give evidence in defence of the scheme, not one responded to the invitation, though a day was specially fixed for the purpose. Now just one word as to the principal on which I think annexation ought to be made in any case where the subject would be considered. It is idle to use such words in this case as "bringing them into one common family." The employment of that phrase has a very losing sound of peace and harmony, but it was mere words. They could not be brought into a common family in the sense of either peace or harmony or union, and this case will resolve itself into this: that the Corporation—being in want of money, and for their own benefit and not for the benefit of the townships, or with a view of promoting the interests of the townships—are desirous of annexing salinity to prosperity for their own schemes only. The principal that has always influenced committees of the House of Commons—the principle of annexation that alone should be of influence with those who consider the subject are—you must consider the interests both of the city and suburbs and of the public at large, and see whether the proposition to annex is not simply a desire on the part of the city to increase its revenue. I use these words advisedly, for they are used in one of the books. The fate that is to be applied in this—is the district sought to be added able to do for itself all that the town could do for it—in other words can it stand alone if it were not joined to the town? That is one great proposition. Is it a fair and reasonable and a true test? Another consideration is, are there any cases in which Parliament has increased the town under similar circumstances as those that exist in the

DUBLIN
May 19, 1881.

present instance; another great test was the feeling of the inhabitants on the subject. In the government of the body sought to be annexed reasonably efficient and good, and is the government of the body which seeks to annex it of such higher quality that the governing body ought to be merged in it? What is the scheme of representation proposed, and what is the scheme of readjustment of taxation? All these considerations must enter into the case and influence your report, and I fearlessly say that in every one of them the Corporation has most signalled failed. Of course you must be influenced to some extent by precedents that have gone before, and so far as the evidence here stands there is no instance—so instance certainly has been given—to you of any township chartered by Act of Parliament being annexed—against its will and against the feeling of the inhabitants, provided its government be efficient and good—to another adjoining corporation. No such instance has been given. In the case of Darlington, which has been referred to, and Blackhouse they did not oppose, while in the case of Bolton the singular result followed that the township sought to be annexed against its will was excluded, while Halswell, which did not oppose, was included. I can understand very good reasons in the case of a township or corporation like Dredge, where there are no townships adjoining it—where there is a country district partly covered with villages within a mile of the centre of the town itself, and no other township created there; but the case was quite different when the proposed annexation is, as in the present case, and against the will of the powers sought to be brought in. Let us see the case the Corporation suggest here. I think it resolves itself into this: that they want money and have not got it, and they want us to be brought in for the purpose of contributing to their vast debt, and for the purpose of carrying out visionary improvements—improvements which all experience of the past leads us to think they will never execute—they desire to bring us into a representation which, whether rightly or wrongly, justly or unjustly, public opinion has universally, and up to the present, condemned as not a good one. The very report under which you are now holding this inquiry—the report of the Committee of the House of Commons—upon the face of it bears a condemnation of the Dublin Corporation. I am not here to say there are not men of business in the Corporation—men of business habits, and good men. Public opinion entirely coincided with the terms of that report out of which your warrant proceeds—out of which it has grown—which has condemned the constitution of the Dublin Corporation as a whole, which pointed out that few of the leading merchants and citizens of Dublin took part now in Municipal affairs, that the attendance of members of the Council was by no means regular or punctual, that it was slack, and its administration defective. The report says:—

"Your Committee are forced to report, with respect to Dublin, that there is ground to complain of the slack attendance at Council meetings; of the postponement of, or inattention to, important subjects within the duties of the Council; of the condition of the streets, the deficiency of sanitary action, the want of necessary and proper control in dealing with offenders and vagrants, and the mixture of different funds in the Corporation accounts contained, notwithstanding the objections of the auditors."

And in strong contrast with that condemnation of the Dublin Town Council stands out the paragraph in the same report:—

"Your Committee have pleasure in mentioning some places, such as Rathmines, Lansdowne, Terenure, Lisburn, &c., where the evidence disclosed a far more satisfactory condition of affairs, or at any rate, sanitary on the part of the Town Commissioners to do their duty."

You could not have a stronger expression of condemnation on the one hand, and by contrast of approbation on the other—approbation for the party now seeking to resist being merged into that representative body. In dealing with the question of the

Corporation wanting money, and it is really the great burthen of the song, there have been arguments addressed to you which, if true, would show they don't want money. Now, Mr. Curtis has proved that in 1881 there will be an increase certainly of £7,000 a year by leases which will fall in within that time, and it is shown that, taking the average as to the duration of leases—life—in twenty years from this date—in 1899 there will be a further revenue from the city exists of £10,000 a year, so that if that is true we are dealing with a case where the Corporation, within twenty years, will have £17,000 a year added to their revenue. But there is another question. Every witness before you has told you that it is an essential condition of any change, that there should be a revaluation of the City of Dublin. It has been passed upon the ground of injustice both to the poor man and to the rich. It damages property in the city, for it prevents people adding to their buildings, for that involves re-valuation, and puts them in a different position from their neighbours. Old buildings too, it would appear, are overvalued, so that on every principle of justice, it has been urged by all the witnesses that there should be a revaluation of Dublin. What would be the result of such a revaluation? It would give at least £200,000 a year more to the city on which taxation could be made, and that is to say, a clear addition to revenue of £20,000. If the evidence on this subject were true, and I have no reason to doubt it, you may be sure no scheme of annexation will be sanctioned by Parliament that does not involve revaluation. The increase in revenue by £20,000 a year would be simply doing justice as between man and man. What, then, are the objections to it, and why is it not done? That it would raise the income tax, and make the Corporation unpopular in this country. Then it was said—by Mr. Beveridge I think—and I take leave to say it is mere bubble of words, that it is the same to the citizen as he pays 3s. on the present valuation as if he had paid, or had to pay, 2s. 6d. on the new valuation. I quite agree it would be regarded his point of view, but in plain English it would come to this, that the higher sum on an unduly low valuation is equal to a lower sum on a fairly higher valuation. That is perfectly true, but far all that it does not stand the test of logic for a moment. In 1840, the Corporation got power to charge a certain improvement rate on a certain valuation, and the evidence is that in 1853—the time when the first Valuation Act was passed—£100,000 a year was struck off the valuation, and the taxable powers of the Corporation—i.e. improvement rate on the valuation given in 1847—was increased, and it would be but justice that it should be raised to the proper valuation. And is that to be answered by any observation made by Mr. Beveridge, or some other witness, that, indeed, they won't exercise that power—that the Dublin Corporation won't exercise the powers and duties the Valuation Act imposed on them, as a Grand Jury, is to have a revised and proper valuation made. And why? Because—this is the reason boldly stated—because, fourthly, it would add £3,000,000 to the Imperial Exchequer.

2356. CHURCHILL.—Not for Dublin!

2356. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—No; but £3,000,000 to the Imperial Exchequer for the country. And that is the reason why the members of this Corporation, for Imperial reasons, are to be influenced from doing what is admitted to be justice. Therefore, if they are to be restored to the position they really got in '49, when these taxation powers were conferred on them, and when Dublin was fairly valued, I now start with this, that they will have a revenue certain in 1881, when the valuation would be completed, of £257,000 a year added to their income, with a prospective increase of £10,000 a year in 1899. Now, so far for the wants of the Corporation. These figures I assume are accurate. They were put forward by Mr. Curtis in another point of view—to tempt the township into the pleasant little parlour plastered by the Corporation for their reception. We must use it as it has been

DUBLIN.
May 13, 1878.

gives, and if it be true evidence, I am perfectly sure, as I conveyed before, that having regard to all the evidence, no recommendation will be ever made by Parliament, at all events unless based on a revaluation of the city, the valuation of which is admittedly unjust and unfair. If Mr. Delany would try only to forget that Home Rule would cure even the evils that exist in townships, if the members of the Council would endeavour to forget this craving after notoriety which some of them have, if they would rise above and get rid of their dislike to be unpopular, and of meek that I think to some has not worked well for the constitution of this great body, among whom are many eminent business men, if they were to forget and do their work without reference to the Imperial Exchequer being increased, they would have under their control, by simply applying for a revaluation of the city, an increase to their revenue of £30,000 a year. Now, I have looked into this evidence with a view to extracting from it any thing in the shape of argument in favour of annexation, and as far as I can see, or understand, in the sure front has been put this theory, which, I take leave to say, is a huge fallacy, namely, the use of the roads and streets of Dublin, by the people of the adjoining townships. It is said, that therefore they should pay a contribution to the maintenance of these streets or roads, and further, that we should bear a share of the old debt that existed on the city—old debts that existed on the city, and were created independent of any township scheme, and long before it was ever thought they would be created, and long before 1847, when, under a report I will call your attention to, after anxious and careful inquiry, Rathmines was constituted in consequence of the state of its roads, and I suppose too, in consequence of the inaction of the Corporation. I could understand if, in 1847, when Rathmines needed paving and lighting, when the roads were in a bad state, the Corporation came forward and tried to annex it—I could understand their saying, that therefore our argument could not have the force it has now, and that there would be some reason in their action but, I suppose the reason that induced the Corporation not to interfere then, was the same as now influences them not to wish for the annexation of Clontarf, namely, that Clontarf is poor, and not able to bear the share of the city burthen. The argument about the roads and streets might appear to have some value as to a rate in aid of the bridge tax, and the police tax, were really analogous, but this argument about the roads is an unsound one. It is said, that there is wear and tear partly by the railways, and partly by the use of the people of the townships. But I would ask, what is a city? A resident in Rathmines, or Penrose, orders his goods in Dublin, and they are delivered in the townships; and coal, timber, merchandise, groceries, and matters of that sort are brought out. Now, it is to be remembered that as far as Rathmines is concerned, the people there pay the entire expense of the maintenance of the roads within their boundary. I think it was said there are twenty-two miles of roads, within the Rathmines township. Is it not like a great city, and with roads leading into it, the great arteries that keep the town alive; like a city, has it not its imports and exports, and coal and timber are brought from the city into the townships, yes and beyond the townships, and out to other districts where they must pass over the township roads—and is there not also brought into the city the produce by which that city is supported? Let us see what is brought into the city; every species of agricultural produce comes through the townships—hay is brought in, straw, staves, bricks for making roads and houses. Mr. Neville, I believe, stated that something like 12,000 tons of stone were brought from beyond the township, using in their passage the township roads, out of which they did not derive any benefit whatsoever. The materials for the streets and buildings, the cattle, all these are brought in from the agricultural districts outside the township, using the township roads which

are entirely maintained by the township, using them for city purposes, and for city purposes alone as regards this traffic of imports. Everyone of us has seen along the Finglas, Howth, and Rathmines roads on different days of the week, hay and straw, and other commodities coming in and going out, coal carts, mairons from the docks of Dublin, and all these going to, or coming from the agricultural districts outside the town, and beyond the township. But there is a reciprocity that must be attended to. The citizens of Dublin is delighted to get his goods sent out to Rathmines—and the streets exist—as I understand the streets of a city—for the purposes of the consumer and the person who sells, and for the purpose of promoting the carrying on of trade within the city. Each derives a common benefit from the great arteries and roads that lead into the city, and a test of this would be if you were to shut up and close the roads of a city, that city could not exist. As to the roads in Rathmines, I may say—they speaking at least of the principal thoroughfares—are paved to one-third of their extent under the town system; and we will give you before the session is over, some returns of the traffic in and out, and therefore, as far as I can understand, this argument about the roads has no existence at all—no foundation whatever, if you consider what a city is—that the streets exist both for consumers and sellers, and that in point of fact, cities cannot exist at all unless it has streets and roads, into these streets by which produce may be brought into them. Well, Mr. Neville has taken up the subject of scavenging, and he refers to two reports of 1853, and 1858, in which he says he recommended that the townships should be annexed, or, that the boundaries of the city of Dublin be extended; but I must say, if the Corporation had in 1853, and 1855, pursuant to their minutes, seen the desirability and justice of annexing the townships, it is a strange thing they allow Acts of Parliament after Acts of Parliament to be passed which they did not oppose, or only to a certain extent—long subsequent to that report—and allow charter after charter to be granted to these townships, and the suggestion of Mr. Neville as to scavenging, is the great difficulty of the city, in not having a place in which to deposit its refuse, and that if the townships were included, he would be able to deposit it there; that showed the care with which Mr. Neville regarded the interests of the townships; indeed, one member of the Town Council suggested that the sweepings should be deposited in a hole at Donnybrook. In considering the benefits to be conferred on Rathmines, and other townships, we cannot shut our eyes to the condition of the public bodies concerned. Mr. Beveridge, when he was asked the question, said he would give one illustration of the benefits to be conferred, and he added that we would get crossings. Well, is it not notorious that as regards the streets of Dublin, the scavenging of these streets was a hy- word in every capital in Europe; nothing can possibly be worse. I think I may safely and confidently say this, that with the exception of some three or four streets paved out of the £30,000 borrowed by the Corporation, the streets were most inadequately cleaned. And if that body—and people cannot shut their eyes to the fact, that it is so—if that body cannot manage their own affairs, and the experience of a hundred years proves them incapable of reasonably managing their own affairs, it is not within the limits of human reason to suppose, that by enlarging the area, and giving them a larger field for mismanagement, they will make any improvement. So much for the roads since 1843. Well then, Mr. Neville—

2357. CHAPMAN.—But, Mr. Walker, remember as to this part of the question, it was stated by Mr. Neville that since 1849 these townships have grown up, and that thereby the traffic has become so great over the streets that it has cut up these streets considerably and settled them, and thus involved the Corporation in the difficulty of maintaining and scavenging them.

2358. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—There is not a word of fact.

DUBLIN,
May 16, 1875.

dation, I would take the liberty of saying, for that argument. Do they mean to say that the streets are worse than they were in 1849. I would rather be inclined to give them credit for saying that they are better than they were in 1849—that something has been done for them. Mr. Neville has given a list of civic improvements that were to be carried out if the Corporation could only get the money to do so—five of them, I think. We live still, however, and nothing has been done—not one of these has been carried out. If they get £10,000 a year from Rathmines it will help them to accomplish these great works, such as abattoirs. They have no funds for that—they were always desirous for it; but if the townships are brought in, their contribution would enable them to erect an abattoir. I think Mr. Cotton would say it is not necessary to erect another abattoir. Of course it would, and it was hard to see what benefit the township would derive from it. When a public body comes and says, not that "we will give you benefits that exist in our city," but benefits which the city never has created, but which, if you give us money, we may hope to create." When such a case occurs, we must look to our experience of past times and see whether from the public acts of the body, townships or cities can place faith in their professions and promises. As to public abattoirs in 1877, powers were sought and the act was unanimously rejected. A general market is wanted, and it is in the hands of a private company—the Corporation have totally failed to do anything of the kind. The Corporation say they should be able to supply gas throughout the townships—supply gas—where they have failed to do it within the city, when at this moment there is one common body supplying gas to the city and the townships. They will be able to supply gas. I think it was my friend Mr. Norwood who pressed, as an argument, on the Commissioners that they had the same gas. The same gas. They might as well say the same sun. The gas is contracted for by a private body to both—the same price in some respects, perhaps dearer, in others cheaper. Baths and wash-houses were also spoken of, in order no doubt that the inhabitants of the townships might look upon a cleaner class of artisans, and benefit thereby. Slaughter-houses were also alluded to. Now, as to slaughter-houses, it would be proved that five licensed slaughter-houses exist in Rathmines, and finally we were to have an extension of the Fire Brigade, and it is fortunate we have the evidence of Captain Ingram on this point. I certainly was sorry to hear and know, as we did from his evidence, that there was such a fiasco in that department. He showed that the condition of the brigade was to a certain extent deplorable, and he summed up with the statement that although an Act of Parliament was passed in 1870 enabling the Waterworks Committee to do everything which Captain Ingram might deem necessary, he summed up with this, that it was well there were not more fires in Dublin, and that in effect Dublin was in a shocking condition as far as the fire brigade was concerned. Now is there any instance of a township being annexed to an adjoining town in order that it might share in the enjoyment of visionary and alleged improvements. Mr. Neville has named some five of these improvements—not one now existing, and which as regards the carrying of them out all past experience teaches us to regard as hopeless. But then we are told there are great sanitary reasons why Dublin ought to be annexed to Rathmines. Now I think that is the last topic that ought to be addressed to the Commissioners on the part of Dublin. We must all admit that we must take these sanitary reasons in conjunction with the question of the main-drainage; for it is impossible there could be good sanitation without good drainage. Now, Dublin stands pre-eminent in one respect. It stands pre-eminent for its death-rate. I presume, owing to that main-drainage defect, Mr. Cameron gave certain reasons why, for sanitary purposes, Rathmines and the other townships should be annexed. There would

then be one governing body as regards the staff. Well, he did want an additional staff. Rathmines has not the same facilities for disinfection, it is urged. All these powers are derived from the Public Health Act, and Rathmines can put it in force as well as the city of Dublin. As to disinfection, it was admitted by Dr. Cameron or Mr. Boyle, that what is done in Rathmines—the burning of clothes—is better than what is done in Dublin by the disinfecting chamber, which Mr. Heron did not like at all. Then it was said by Mr. Boyle that it would be a great advantage to the townships to be annexed to Dublin, because there would be one central authority to supervise the sewers. It is material to call attention to the history of the supervision of the sewers. We know, unfortunately, what the history of this is. In 1870 an Act was passed which empowered the Corporation to get from a public fund £300,000 for this purpose; and in 1871 an Act was passed, constituting the Main drainage Board, on which there were members both of Fonthill and Rathmines. Five years passed, and nothing was done. The members of the townships—you will hear from the evidence to be given before you—attended, and, in consequence of the slothfulness of the Corporation, in consequence of their alethical action, five years passed; and what happened in 1877? The Rathmines and Fonthill townships themselves, seeing the helplessness of Dublin over dealing with the question of sanitation, themselves came forward to promote a Bill in Parliament; and I ask your attention now—asking as you are in the position of the Committee of the House of Commons—out of whose report your warrant is the outcome, to the preamble and provisions of that Bill which is now a legislative enactment! It forms a standing enactment, constituting to the sanction of the Dublin Corporation in sanitation and main-drainage. It is called "The Rathmines and Fonthill Main Drainage and Improvement Act, 1877," and recites that it is an Act—

"To authorize the construction, by a Board specially constituted, of cuttall and other sewers for the townships of Rathmines and Rathgar and Fonthill, townships in the county of Dublin, to release those townships from the provisions of 'The Dublin Main Drainage and Purification of the Liffey Act, 1874,' and of 'The Sanitary Law (Dublin) Amendment Act, 1870 to 1875,' to confer certain additional powers upon the Township Committees within their respective townships, to alter the date of election of Commissioners in the Rathmines and Rathgar Township, and for other purposes."

It recites the Rathmines and Rathgar Act and the Fonthill Act. It recites—

"And whereas the Rathmines and Rathgar Township and the Fonthill Township (hereinafter referred to as 'The Townships') are large, populous, and increasing districts; and in each case the population and number of buildings have of late years greatly increased and are still increasing."

It recites—

"That, by the 'Act of 1874,' the Public Works Loan Commissioners were empowered to advance to the Town Council of the city of Dublin, upon the security of the rate or fees, out of which expenses incurred by the Town Council, as the sewer and drainage authority within the said city under the Sanitary Act, 1865, might be defrayed, any sum or sums not exceeding on the whole £300,000, to be applied by the Town Council in the execution of the works necessary for the purpose of purifying the river Liffey and completing the main drainage of the city of Dublin."

It recites—

"That, by the 'Dublin Main Drainage Act, 1871,' it was recited, that for the purpose of offering the purification of the river Liffey, and for purifying the main drainage of the city, it was necessary that the works contemplated in the Act of 1870 should be speedily undertaken and completed."

It recites—

"That whereas representations were made to the Town ship Commissioners by or on behalf of the Town Council

DUBLIN,
May 15, 1873

of the city of Dublin, with regard to the efficiency of the estimate of £850,000 for the said works, and otherwise in relation to the said works; and thereupon the Commissioners agreed that the sewage of the townships, or of parts thereof, should be led into the intercepting sewers authorized by that Act, and that certain rates in respect of such intercepting sewers, when made, should be paid by the townships respectively to the Town Council or Corporation of Dublin. But no provision was, by the Dublin Main Drainage Act, 1871, made for the drainage of that portion of the Fingaline Township situated east and west of the river Dodder, which was excluded from the operation of that Act."

It further recites:—

"And whereas the Corporation have not substantially commenced or carried out the works authorized by the Dublin Main Drainage Act, 1871, and have not succeeded in obtaining any advance from the Public Works Loan Commissioners for the purchase of lands necessary for the purposes of the undertaking was allowed to expire on the 15th day of July, 1870, without any steps effectual for the purpose having been taken by the Corporation to obtain an extension of time."

"And whereas the Township Commissioners have meanwhile been educated with legal proceedings for suffering the sewage of the townships to flow into the river Dodder."

"And whereas the works authorized or contemplated by the recited Acts of 1870, 1871, and 1873, for the reasons aforesaid having failed, and the representations made to the Township Commissioners, in 1871, having been wholly unfulfilled, it is expedient that the Township Commissioners and the townships respectively, be released from all duty, liability, or responsibility under the Dublin Main Drainage Act, 1871, or under the Sanitary Law (Dublin) Amendment Act, 1870 to 1873, and that the provision of the Dublin Main Drainage Act, 1871, so far as they relate to the townships, or either of them, be now repealed."

There cannot be a stronger condemnation of the inaction of Dublin than Parliament has there spread on the face of that Act. And under that Act, as you are aware, a contract has been entered into, and those works are now advancing, as I have heard, towards completion. Two and a half miles out of four have already been constructed. Now, so much for sanitation. What is this matter about the extension of the Fire Brigade? The argument as regards the extension of the Fire Brigade is that you should have a system of telegraphy extended all through the townships, and, in other words, to extend to the townships the benefits the city enjoys. But Captain Ingram told you of these benefits. He told you that he had but one station and nineteen men, though a balance of £1,000 of a surplus remains applicable to it, and though they have full powers, under the Waterworks Act, for the purpose of creating the very system which Captain Ingram said was necessary in order that Dublin might be safe, and the result of the evidence of Captain Ingram on this Fire Brigade system is that Dublin is now in a most miserable condition as regards its Fire Brigade. His emphatic words were—"Dublin is perfectly unsafe, and it is well there are not more fires." He said he might almost say he had not a station, and that he should have sixty men, and that we should share in the benefits of this Fire Brigade system, and which was as inefficient for the purpose at present. For the past thirteen years one fire a year has occurred in the townships as against one every day in the City of Dublin, and we were to share in the burden of sixty or sixty-one men required for the two steamers or engines, and for the fire escapes, in order to enjoy the benefits that Dublin enjoys from that materially worked and financially deficient Fire Brigade, according to Captain Ingram's evidence.

2359. CHAIRMAN.—I did not understand Captain Ingram to say it was inefficient. On the contrary, I understood him to say that it was quite as efficient as it could possibly be, having regard to the number of the staff, but that they had not money enough, and that the raising of three halfpence in the pound authorized by the Act for the maintenance of the system was not sufficient.

2360. Mr. Walker, q.c.—And £1,000 is hand.

2361. Mr. Corcoran.—The evidence was that they were not using the whole of their power.

2362. Mr. Walker, q.c.—No; they had a balance in hand, and their powers were unused. Captain Ingram's description should be remembered, that Dublin is practically unsafe, and it is well there are not more fires in the city. Now, we were told that it would be a great benefit to the townships that there should be an artisan class springing up within them, and that it would be a great benefit to them that the Artisans' Dwellings scheme should be provided within the city, because the artisans of Dublin build the townships. That is one of those arguments which proves vastly too much. Artisans, and people of the working classes generally, will always go to the city. It is like a great magnet—they go to the city, where they get lodgings cheaper, and more for their labour. No system of annexation will create an artisan class in the townships, and as a matter of fact, I may inform you there are already in Rathmines a considerable number of houses fit and suitable for the accommodation of the artisans, but as to their residing in the town, if it is an evil, an amputation cannot cure that. They will always live within the city, and it is to be observed that as to that artisan class, they build everywhere besides the townships, and bring back money to the support of their families, and spend it in the city. I don't see what, under this scheme, the Corporation has done, or, indeed, can do, under the Act of Parliament, except to clear a space, and then after that the work is carried on by a private individual or a company—a private enterprise practically—assured to be a self-supporting scheme, and therefore it ought not to be urged that any burthen in this regard should be placed upon the township.

2363. CHAIRMAN.—But, Mr. Walker, the fact of the artisans' dwelling almost entirely in Dublin is stated largely to increase the death-rate, and the hospital charges in the city; and when the heads of families of that class become ill, they and their families all become chargeable on the rates.

2364. Mr. Walker, q.c.—That is what I say no system of annexation will cure. No system will make them live elsewhere than where they do; therefore, the condition of the artisans cannot be improved by annexation, they will always live in the city unless you burn down the houses in which they live, clear them out, and construct others for them, under the Artisans' Dwelling Act, and that is in one respect in the nature of private enterprise and not one involving a burthen on the taxation of the city. Some observations were made about the system of prisons—that we don't contribute to them; that may be left out, however, of our consideration, for the prisons are now supported by the Government—except in respect of the salaries or allowances of some officers which will die out. Industrial schools and Lunatic asylums have been also mentioned. All these, I would take leave to remind you, are contributed to in the proportion of our county at large charge, and it is not unnatural to suppose that the lunatics and the sinks of Dublin who go to the asylums or the industrial schools come, not from the townships, but from the city, where they are most likely to be found. Now, another material matter was this question of water. I am now dealing with Rathmines, and I call your attention to the way Rathmines is supplied with water. It has a separate supply, which existed in Rathmines before the Vartry did in the city—it was created under an Act of Parliament—I will call your attention to whom I came to open the affirmative case. There is a permissive right to avail themselves of the Vartry water, but it was never availed of—there was an agreement proposed, but it was never carried out. We have expended, under the advice of Mr. Bateman, a sum of £30,000 on a water supply which was as good a supply, and as to which there is no fault found; and of that £30,000 £9,000 has been already paid, so that now there is only a £30,000 debt existing in Rathmines in respect of the water supply created under Mr. Bateman's

DEBATE.

May 15, 1878.

service, and is it now to be proposed that we should pay for a separate water supply the one-third rate, and also have to pay £20,000 debt, and a rate for the purpose of paying the interest on it? Oh, it was said, the waterworks debt will be wiped off in 1909, and that thus Dublin would get water free, and that Rathmines would get the benefit of it. Now I take leave to say, and Mr. M'Evoy was of the same opinion, that there was no instance in which a waterworks debt is wiped off. They may be diminished, but not wiped out; filter-beds, new mains, new reservoirs, repairs, and so on, are constantly calling for supervision and expense.

2365. CHAIRMAN.—That applies to your own system too.

2366. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—Well long before 1909 additional works will be required, I venture to say; and it is a mere chimera to say that the waterworks debt will be by that time non-existent or wiped out. There is another thing, and quite independent of the fact that Rathmines has a separate water supply created under Act of Parliament, a supply which was allowed to exist by the Corporation. Why did the Corporation make an agreement with the townships on certain basis for the supply of water as a continuing township, and now ask to get rid of that and to bring them in. That was a contract on the faith of which money was expended, and it would be most unjust to alter it, or any other existing contracts. Now one word as to the city debt. According to the evidence of Mr. Carter, I think, there was something like £200,000 due by the city, and it is gravely to be asked that we are to be made liable for that or for £886,000—it is gravely to be asked that the township of Rathmines should be made liable to the city debts which had existence long before the Rathmines township had ever been constituted. There is a city estate debt of about £300,000, a large portion of which existed in 1840, and it is on the theory that the city rental may rise that the proposition is put forward that we are to be brought in to the arms of the city, and to have a liability in respect of the £300,000, to incur which we did not contribute. Is it to be said that that is a just or fair proposition? We know that the borough rate in practice has proved wholly insufficient for the charges on it, no matter what may be said to the contrary. In practice it is wholly insufficient—£5,200 was the deficit against the borough rate. Now there is on the improvement rate £1,733 debt at present existing, and remember that all these moneys were borrowed on a scheme wholly independent of the townships—it had nothing to do with the townships, and it is to be said the townships are to be brought in and made as one common family, sharers in £866,000 of debt, on hopes— visionary ones indeed—of those debts being ever reduced, or for the purpose of getting a visionary improvement. Is there any precedent in the whole history of legislation for bringing in a solvent and prosperous township solely to share the fortunes of an insolvent city. There was three scales of taxation laid before you in the course of this inquiry on the part of the Corporation.

2367. CHAIRMAN.—When you speak of precedents, Mr. Walker, what do you say to the cases in England, where they made them liable to the debts of the town, but did not make them liable to taxation for a period of five years.

2368. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—Give me any instance, give me any case, and I will deal with it. It was said in a general sort of way, that in Manchester, or some other places they were brought in, but it also appears there are separate accounts kept of everything, even of those townships brought in. But you are sitting here under a warrant to consider a scheme of taxation. That is what you are to do, and all I have to deal with is the scheme of taxation suggested, and to see whether any man holding vested rights of private property would entertain this. I can only deal with the scheme suggested. When the inquiry commenced there was none at all suggested, and it was said it would be handed in, and after a while, it grew and was narrowed;

and on the 11th of April, I think, it was handed in—the scheme of taxation—the final scheme, for there was not one on the 8th, 10th, and 11th of April. That scheme is this, it is on this principle. The total amount required for the purposes of a joint body would be some £169,500 a year, in round numbers. There is an 6d. in the pound, merciful percentage rate—and I take leave to say that is incorrect to legislate with.

2369. CHAIRMAN.—I find that Mr. Beveridge, in his evidence, states that in 1875, the boundaries of Darlington were extended—that the measure was opposed by some of the districts proposed to be brought in, that still they were brought in and made liable to the existing debts, and the ordinary rates.

2370. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—I take leave to say, that there is not a word of foundation for that. It can be proved from the accounts of Darlington. I admit, of course, that the extension was made, and that outside districts were annexed; but I deny that it was against their will, or that they came in and shared the debts of Darlington. The accounts of Darlington could be produced, and they will show that.

2371. CHAIRMAN.—At page seven, of Mr. Browne's pamphlet, he speaks in a note of the extra city extension. He says, referring to the opinion expressed by the committee who sat on the Derby Extension Bill (1877): The Chairman said:—

"The committee have agreed to pass the preamble, upon certain conditions. First, with respect to the borough rate, we should lay down the condition, that the borough rate, for the several districts, should not for five years exceed 6d. in the pound; and with respect to the School Board rate, the condition should be laid down that for the same period, the School Board rate should not, in the districts which are now within a School Board, exceed 1d. in the pound."

The promoters of the Bolton Improvement Bill, 1877, were willing to make a like concession for a period of ten years to the districts they sought to include. We don't know what the proposals were with respect to Bolton.

2372. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—We do know—we know at least, as regards Bolton, that the township that opposed was excluded, and that Hollinwell, that did not, was included. But what I set out with is this, that there is no instance passed of a township with a chartered constitution being annexed against its will, and annexed under the terms under which it is here sought, with all the burthens of the city. No instance of that has been shown, and the instance you have given proves the contrary.

2373. CHAIRMAN.—I have looked over the evidence given before the Local Government Committee—the only two independent witnesses examined there were Mr. Pin and Mr. Stokes; all the rest were members of the Corporation (there was in addition Mr. M'Evoy), the rest, I say, were either members of the Corporation or parties connected with the sanitary state of the city. Mr. Stokes in his evidence was decidedly against any annexation of Rathmines. Mr. Pin was in favour of it to a certain extent, but after all that, the committee of the House of Commons reported that it appeared to be considered, that Dublin required extension.

2374. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—The word used is "alleged," and it is because it is an open question, as it appears to me, that the committee adopted the course they did. If it was a conceded matter, the committee would never have had an inquiry, with a view to ascertain the real facts, able Commissioners were appointed to inquire into the question, whether the extension was necessary or advisable, or looked for by the inhabitants. That is to say, it is alleged the boundaries of Dublin require extension—we have heard the allegation, and not considering it proved, we refer it to a Royal Commission.

2375. CHAIRMAN.—You say, Mr. Walker, that there was no case where, against the wishes and views of the governing body, or township, an extension was granted, or would be granted—if that be so, when Mr.

DUBLIN.
May 15, 1912

Stokes, the late chairman of the township said, "on no terms will we go into the city," why, or what was the reason of our being sent to hold this inquiry, if there has been a fixed rule of the committee of Parliament, never to annex an out-lying district against the wishes of its inhabitants?

2376. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—But, Mr. Stokes might have been considered by the committee, not to have represented the whole of the township.

2377. CHAIRMAN.—Well, he appeared as chairman, having filled that position for fifteen years, to speak on behalf of the inhabitants.

2378. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—Very probably it was to be insisted on these matters, to find out whether the feeling of the inhabitants was properly represented by him, that the inquiry you are now holding was promoted. It would be a fact if you think the report there binds you to say opinion, or that you are merely to register the opinion. You have to inquire into certain facts, and certain facts which presuppose your mind is free.

2379. Mr. Hines.—The Darlington town clerk writes—

"The boundaries of this borough were extended by the Local Act, passed in 1875, and the new part becomes liable to all the rates existing before the borough, and to the ordinary rates of the borough."

2380. CHAIRMAN.—Well, that is what Mr. Brown says in his pamphlet.

2381. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—What I said was that no instance was shown of a body having a constitution being annexed against its will. There may, of course, have been such case, but I have heard of none. If there is any value in Mr. Brown's pamphlet, we have in the first pages of it, the principles which are to guide a system of annexation, and what you have to ascertain is how these principles work in the present consideration. I was about to deal with the scheme of taxation suggested; and I may remind you that there is ultimately only one suggested towards the close of the inquiry. It is this: The total sum required for the purposes of the joint body would be, it is stated, £180,000 a year in round numbers. For that purpose a rate of 4s. 6d. would be required, and that, I take leave to say, is wrong, for the 4s. 6d., when admitted, would be raised to a sum of 4s. 1d. next year; but, taking it at 4s. 6d., what is the result of spreading all that over the township of Rathmines—the township with which I am dealing—would be—all but a penny-doubling. The present rate in Rathmines, which is 2s. (in two years it reached 2s. 4d. under exceptional circumstances), so that it would have its rate doubled,—more than doubled, I might say; and the result, in round numbers, to Rathmines, if this scheme of annexation and taxation were adopted, would be that £10,000 a year exactly would be put on Rathmines township—£10,000 a year, that is double the rate it has. What I ask you, is Rathmines to get for that £10,000 a year? A mayor, a sword-bearer, and, as Mr. Byrnes said, "You will become the 'owners of my estate'"—like scholars of collage, owning college estate. It will be a great benefit, we will get crossings, Mr. Beveridge said. I failed to learn, though I asked over and over again, what benefit we were to derive for that money except merely sentimental advantages—artisans looking cleaner, better stimulus to city improvements, and so on; but looking at Rathmines and within its limits, I have failed to see any improvement to be given to Rathmines, except visionary improvements and hopeless ones, as far as my experience goes. Take the case of the Fire Brigade. Any extension will involve expense, and it will be as heavily worked for the new district as it appears it is for the city. Well, new Rathmines has a newly constituted rain drainage authority, and the inhabitants having borrowed £10,000, have been obliged to pay 4d. in the pound on their valuation in the future. It was said it would be a great benefit to Rathmines if they took over the Rathmines Drainage Works, and paid that 4d. No doubt it would be

a benefit, putting it in that way; but it was much like the case of one man owing £1 and another £10, and they become partners for better or worse; and the man owing £10 pays the debt of the other, who in turn pays what the other owes. In other words, Rathmines would be a loss to the tune of about ten to one on the transaction. Another great test to be applied in this case is, the public feeling on the matter amongst the inhabitants of the township and the public feeling of the body that constitutes those who ask to annex them. So far as public feeling within this city, there is not a single expression of independent opinion by independent men, on the part of the Corporation scheme. The only independent citizen was Mr. Finn, and he repudiated emphatically the township being annexed, unless vested interests were strictly preserved. Now, no public meeting has been held; and in no way has public opinion been gauged. Though invited to attend here, independent witnesses have not come, and therefore it is, I say, that as to public opinion in the city, it is wanting, and as to public opinion in the township of Rathmines, you will hear what it is.

2382. Mr. Cowan.—What was the invitation you refer to, asking the people to attend?

2383. Mr. Walker.—I mean there was notice in the papers that you were prepared to hear any evidence on the part of the city or township, for or against annexation. I will submit to you evidence showing that the feeling of Rathmines is against this annexation, and you have it at least that there is a total absence of expression of opinion in the city in favour of it, though full opportunity was given by you by public advertisement to have that expression of opinion given.

2384. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, but at the same time the Corporation, representing the citizens, have passed the resolution asking it to be done. No citizen or class of citizens, have come forward to say, "We don't want it"; no public opinion has been given by individuals, except by Mr. Finn, Mr. Delany, and Mr. McEvoy; and the latter is not on one side or the other.

2385. Mr. Walker.—Now, another consideration, and a very strong element in the case, is the action of the two representative bodies—the representative body seeking to annex, and the representative body of those sought to be annexed. Now, if ever there was a body, asking to annex, condemned by public opinion—I care not why or wherefore, fairly or unfairly—that body is the Corporation of Dublin. Has it, I ask, commanded the confidence of the citizens of Dublin? Is it not rather proved that the higher classes of the citizens are not anxious to join that body?—It is condemned by the report of that very Committee under which you are sitting, and taking into consideration this qualification, what is the evidence given before you? It varies to some extent. One witness said he would pay some attention to property, but great many of them said that property was not at all the consideration, but population. It is not noticeable that the more respectable men in the township would not join that body—they do not in the city,—and do you think if the township bodies were annexed all the eminent men of property, who are now Commissioners of those bodies, would not leave a place where they would be outnumbered in votes, and where imperial matters and other matters that ought not to enter into the views of Commissioners or Corporations would be likely to influence the body? I ought to say something about Alkieran Gregg's scheme, put forward at the end of the case. His scheme illustrates the action of the Corporation—he would cut all these townships in two and annex only the parts that are near the city, because the others would be more difficult to manage. It shows what the real views of the Corporation are. What they want is money for themselves, and they do not at all consider the benefit of the people they want to annex. Now I have said a few words of the motives of the Corporation and the

DEBATES.
May 13, 1878.

arguments on which these views are based; and now it is right that I should call your attention to the history of the legislation constituting the Rathmines township, and see how it grew out of what circumstances. The Rathmines township is constituted under an Act of the 10 & 11 Vic., chap. 253 (Local) and Personal, and in that year—the year of its constitution, 1847—the year that the two Acts regulating townships were passed, the waterworks clauses, and the Town Commissioners Act, and in the same year an inquiry was held in Dublin which led ultimately to the passing of the Act of 1845. Contemporaneously with all those great moves there was held in Dublin an inquiry to ascertain whether Rathmines should not be constituted into an independent township. There was a Royal Commission directed to Mr. Hayward and Mr. Beaumont in 1847, they sat and heard evidence and made a report, which I have in my hand, unanimously recommending that the township should be constituted with the powers which the Act confers. The Corporation afterwards opposed that bill, but notwithstanding that opposition in 1847 the Act was passed reciting that Rathmines was becoming a great and populous district, and that it would be for the advantage of the inhabitants and the public if the streets, market places, and so forth, were better lighted, cleaned, paved, and so forth. Under it they have very large powers as regards water—power of constructing necessary waterworks for the purpose of a sufficient and wholesome supply, power to enter into such contracts as may be necessary for such supply. They may, under section 17, take it from the Dodder or elsewhere; they have also powers of laying down main pipes, manufacturing gas for the purpose of lighting streets and public places, of levying tolls, and maintaining the roads and bridges within their district, and to pay annually such proportion as is mentioned in the 7th & 8th Victoria—the Grand Jury Act for the County—and powers of levying rates not exceeding 2s in the pound. At that period the valuation of Rathmines was £39,750, and the population 10,187, and the area included in this Act was 1,000s. Jr. 30s. In 1862 the inhabitants of Rathgar were so impressed by the benefits they saw conferred on Rathmines by this energetic action that they sought an incorporation with Rathmines, and by the 35th of Victoria, cap. 25, passed in June, 1863, they were annexed to it with all the powers and benefits conferred by the other Act. It recited the expediency of the addition, and the fact that a large sum having been spent on sewerage works by the one the other should extend them in like manner. The valuation added was £8,100 and the population 1,806. The Corporation on that occasion opposed not the bill, but only one clause for the purpose of enabling them to preserve certain rights in common with the Vartry water. Another district was added, which we may call Harold's Cross district, by the Act 29 Vic., cap. 12. The Act of 1860 was opposed by the Corporation only on water clauses, and now that is the third charter, as we may call it, of Rathmines. The valuation now of the entire district is £98,060, and the population 20,363, the area being 1,470s. Jr. 18s.

2386. Mr. Corcoran.—Was that the population in 1871?

2387. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—Yes, we have no means of giving it to you exceptly that census. You may take it to be now in round numbers 23,000, so that, in other words, under these three Acts of Parliament the corporation has been allowed to grow up to about one-twelfth the city population, about one-twelfth the valuation, and about one-sixth the acreage, under these three Acts of Parliament, one of which was opposed, the others only on clauses; and that valuation represents an expenditure of an enormous sum for building, on the faith of the township remaining separate, £1,200,100 expended on the faith of its remaining a township. I come now to the constitution of the body of Commissioners. There are twenty-one members at present—five form a quorum. The

qualification of the Commissioners is residence and Poor-law valuation of £30 a year, and for non-residents of £300. Of the electors the qualification is residence and a rating of £10 a year. It is desirable that instead of that should be adopted the Dublin one, which, according to witnesses here, should be considered wholly independent of property. Now, another material circumstance to be taken into consideration is this, that the entire of this township of Rathmines, except an infinitesimal portion, is within the electoral division of Rathmines. Now, sir, so much for the constitution of the Rathmines Board of Commissioners. Having got this Act of Parliament they erected water-works, under the advice of Mr. Petman, at Gollanstown, which were completed in 1863, before the Vartry came to Dublin, and for which they paid to the Canal Company. In consequence of the extension of the township, they erected additional works at a cost of £11,000, which made a total cost in respect of the works of £29,000, of which £9,000 has been repaid, and the balance, £20,000, according to the terms of their loan, will be paid off in twenty-seven years. The debts are held by the public, and the debt will be wiped off completely at the end of twenty-seven years.

2388. CHAIRMAN.—Would not the same observation apply to your case, Mr. Walker, as we heard in reference to the Corporation, that a water-works debt is never cleared off, or something to that effect?

2389. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—Not the same at all as the city.

2390. CHAIRMAN.—But surely you, too, will require further expenditure in respect of filter beds, repairs, and so on.

2391. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—Well, leave me. The facts will speak for themselves. We always meet our engagements. The debts are taken up by the public. You will have regard to the difference between the £20,000 and the debt existing on the Corporation works, and the extent of them, and also to this fact, that a sum of £6,020 has been spent on the sewerage of the township, and on the distinct faith of its separate constitution. I have already called your attention to the Bill presented, in '77, by Rathmines and Penrose township for their main drainage, which was passed, notwithstanding the opposition of the Corporation in both the Houses of Lords and Commons—in the Commons at least, not in the Lords—and under that Bill the works are now substantially advanced. Therefore, within the last two years, we have a legislative recognition of the separate existence of the Rathmines township, a distinct recognition of its separate existence as against the very body now seeking to annex them on grounds, very many of which are condemned by that preamble of the Act of 1877. Under the section of this Act, 52nd, 53rd, and 54th, the Corporation were afforded an opportunity of joining in the construction of the out-fall sewer which would drain the south side of the city. They did nothing, and the works are consequently being carried out by the townships themselves, and, in point of fact, have advanced to this extent, that two and a half miles out of four and a half have been completed. There are in Rathmines four slaughter houses constituted by Act of Parliament; the supply of gas is exactly the same as in the City of Dublin. We pay for the lamps £3 12s. each; the distance, of course, is greater than the city, and there is greater risk and liability to waste, which makes it a little dearer. The paving is perfectly good, and the death-rates, I take leave to say, is in singularly favourable contrast to that of the city. It is sixteen per 1,000 in Rathmines, and twenty-five in Dublin. Especially, you will find with respect to syphonic disease from the Registrar's returns, that a great many people sent out to Rathmines for change of air die there, so that a great many cases of persons who die there ought really to be attributed to Dublin. You know the startling rates in Dublin. The fees in the accounts for 1877-78 do not represent the amounts expended—there are amounts put down

BESSING.
May 15, 1870.

which require the sanction of the Local Government Board. As regards the sanitation of Rathmines, you will find by the evidence that it is in a very satisfactory state. As stress was laid on the matter of dwellings for the artisan classes, I may mention that there are 455 houses suitable for families of persons of the artisan class in Rathmines. Take the drainage, which is material in sanitation, Rathmines stands out pre-eminently as superior to Dublin. No one can deny that, and as regards the constitution of the body who manage them, no one will deny that, as far as regards the qualification, and I think as regards the attendance to their duties and the absence from their meetings of distracting topics, they are superior to the governing body of the city of Dublin. In support of that I can refer not only to the evidence, but to the very report under which you now sit. Now, I say the administration of affairs in Rathmines is in singular contrast with that of Dublin as regards its drainage—it contrasts most favourably with the city administration as regards the condition of the streets, and, in fact, in every element that can be taken into consideration, the governing body of Rathmines is this not only to stand alone, but to stand favourably in contrast with that body seeking its annexation. Our body commands confidence in Rathmines—the other, I venture to say with the utmost confidence, does not command the confidence of the city of Dublin. I will not anticipate the evidence to be given. We will examine a number of witnesses, who will bear out every statement I have made. Perhaps I ought to mention here as a fit opportunity something about Drumcondra. The Drumcondra Act was passed in '75. It is hardly in being—hardly becomes a township—when it is sought to be eaten up by the Corporation of Dublin. It is right to say that they give us no evidence, no reason why it should be annexed except for the purpose of a frontier. No evidence has been given as to the feeling within it, or of a desire to annex it on the part of any of the inhabitants, and, in fact, the only reason suggested is the one I say, that with reference to the frontier. No evidence has been given showing the number of buildings in it, but I may tell you one or two facts about it. Since the Act of Parliament passed, building has commenced considerably within the township. Over 100 houses already have been built. The valuation of Drumcondra is £13,860, the area 854 acres, and it has

a population of 3,200. Three-fourths of Drumcondra is laid unbuilt on. The feeling of the inhabitants generally is against annexation, as will be proved to you. Since the Act passed considerable building has taken place on the faith of its separate existence. I may mention—I don't know if you got the exact figure—that in Dublin it is admitted by witnesses that 350 acres are not built on, because the people prefer going into the township. Now, taking into account every element that ought to influence you in the consideration of this question—the feeling of the inhabitants, the character of the two governing bodies, the administration of their affairs, the debts existing in the one case, the scheme laid before you—taking into consideration every element that ought to influence you, I submit, on behalf of Rathmines, whose constitution four Acts of Parliament have created or recognised, that you ought not to annex this solvent and steadily growing township to what every one has said is a decaying city. To my mind, it would be the union of youth and age—solvency and pauperism—for the purpose of conferring no benefit upon Rathmines, but for the purpose simply of putting money into the pockets of the Corporation, in the hope that it may administer its affairs better than a century of experience has led me to hope can be possible.

2322. CHAIRMAN.—On the subject of vested interests. Mr. Walker, I would remind you of how the Legislature regarded that when they put on the bridge tax. Did it not interfere with vested interests to the extent of 2s. in the pound, at all events?

2323. Mr. Walker.—Well, I am glad you mentioned that, because it is easily answered. The bridge tax was imposed under exceptional circumstances, and under all Grand Jury Acts the tax for bridges is imposed on the entire county, not on the barony, and the practical reason is this, that there would not be money to bind them only for that.

2324. CHAIRMAN.—Am I to understand, Mr. Walker, that the Commissioners and people of Rathmines think they should not pay a farthing towards maintaining and converging the roads and streets of Dublin?

2325. Mr. Walker.—Not a farthing. They pay already for their own roads, and the city ought to pay for them. We will now proceed to examine witnesses.

Mr. John McEvoy handed in a memorial from certain ratepayers of Dublin. (See Appendix No. 17.)

Mr. JOHN H. EVANS examined by Mr. Andrews, Q.C.

Mr. John H.
EVANS.

2326. You, I believe were one of the original Commissioners of Rathmines township, named in their original act of 1847?—Yes. I was named in the act.

2327. Believe you continued a Commissioner down to 1862?—Yes, down to 1862.

2328. And I believe you were appointed Secretary?—Yes.

2329. And since 1862, continuously to the present time, you have continued their Secretary?—Yes.

2330. You reside in Rathmines?—Yes. I have resided in it all my lifetime.

2331. I believe you have considerable property in land and houses?—I have both land and houses.

2332. Now, before your first act of 1847 was passed, I believe there was an inquiry under the Act 9th and 10th Vic., 1806 then in force?—Yes, I gave evidence upon that commission.

2333. And they reported to the House of Lords in 1847?—Yes.

2334. And I need only refer to the report of the Commissioners. The report says—

"At the first meeting the promoters appeared, and fully proved the preamble of the Bill. From the evidence they laid before us, as well as from our personal survey, it appeared that the district is well adapted in all respects for a separate system of local administration and taxation. It

also appeared that the great majority of the inhabitants and other persons interested, were favourable to the Bill. Plans were produced and scientific evidence given to show the feasibility of supplying the district with water, as well as draining, lighting, and other improvements in a sound and uniform system, and the only objections made struck us as of a most trifling kind."

We will supply that to the Commissioners and all other documents. Now, my Lord Morpeth and Miles were the Commissioners, and your Act of 1847 was passed?—Yes.

2335. I believe the Corporation opposed your Act of 1847?—Yes. They did.

2336. But they opposed it in the Lords only?—Yes.

2337. They were beaten there and did not oppose it in the Commons?—They did not.

2338. Now, I don't wish to go very freely into it, for the Commissioners will have a copy of the Act; but it may be well to give a general reference to how you stood under the Act of 1847. If the Commissioners will look at the map they will see the portion included in the Act of 1847, the portion subsequently added in 1863, and the portion added in 1866. The map shows the township under these three Acts.

2339. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, that is within the large blue line.

BURGESS
May 16, 1878.
Mr. John H.
Evans.

2410. Mr. Anderson.—Now I will give you particulars respecting the Act of 1847, first. The Act of 1847 comprised portion which at the time of the Act was valued at £34,750 per annum—but that is so, but it was reduced in 1852 to £34,000.

2411. Now, the population according to the only census there was then, in the census of 1841, was 16,187½—Yes, 10,000 and some odd numbers.

2412. And the area I believe was 1,020 acres?—Yes.

2413. The qualification of Commissioners for the township under that Act is the qualification still?—Yes.

2414. That is for residents a £50 annual poor-law rating.

2415. And non-residents?—Ownership of property of £200 a year profits and upwards.

2416. Your electoral qualification is a £10 rating for residential?—Yes, and it is the only qualification; there being no other qualification.

2417. Now there are eighteen Commissioners under that Act of 1847—Eighteen, and three subsequently were added when the extension was made.

2418. Under that Act you obtained powers to supply yourself with water, and constructed waterworks?—We did. In fact, under the Act of 1847, Rathmines was entrusted with entire powers of that kind and I may further add, that it was two years before the Corporation of Dublin obtained similar powers.

2419. Then you had powers for waterworks, and gasworks if you wished to supply gas, and your improvement rate was limited to 2d. in the £ without consent, and to 2s. 6d. with the consent of the ratepayers, such consent to be given at a special meeting for the purpose?—Yes.

2420. To consider the case?—Yes.

2421. Your borrowing powers were £20,000, I believe, and they were never exercised as I understand, until the waterworks were taken up?—Never.

2422. Now, as far as the Act of 1847. In 1862, I believe, Mr. Evans, the adjoining townlands of Rathgar and Sallymountain applied to be included within your limits or area?—They promised that Bill themselves. They had, I believe, an independent Parliamentary Agent as well as I remember.

2423. Now, that I believe was not opposed by the Corporation?—Well, no, except on the water clause.

2424. That was simply to preserve their rights?—Yes.

2425. Now the property comprised in the Act of 1862, was not so large, it was only a matter of £8,100 a year?—Yes, about £8,000.

2426. And the population from the census of 1861, was 1,800?—Just so.

2427. That district was not an improving one at the time?—No, not at the time, it was not. They saw the improvement going on in Rathmines, and were anxious if possible to take advantage of it.

2428. As an index of what amalgamation did, give the Commissioners the valuation in 1866 of the district that was added; the valuation in 1866 of Rathgar and Sallymountain?—Well, it has increased very much; the present valuation is about £19,000.

2429. Mr. Corriss.—Of Rathgar?—

2430. Mr. Evans.—Yes. Of Rathgar and Sallymountain.

2431. Mr. Anderson.—Now, if you have the population, give it?—By the census of 1871, it was 50,162; at present it is 55,000 and some odd hundreds for the entire township.

2432. The Act was the 25th of Victoria, chap. 25, and under it the eighteen Commissioners became increased to twenty-one?—Yes. Rathgar was satisfied with three.

2433. CHAIRMAN.—Does that arrangement exist now?—Yes, it does. Eighteen are returned by Rathmines and three by Rathgar—one ward for Rathmines and one for Rathgar.

2434. Mr. Anderson.—In 1866 the 29th Vic., chap. 12, was passed, and then portion of the parish of St. Catherine's was added?—Yes.

2435. That is the last Act constituting the township?—Yes.

2436. Would you give the present valuation of the entire district?—The valuation of the entire township is £98,000.

2437. Is there an increasing population in Rathmines?—Yes; we calculate it to be about 25,000.

2438. And the total area?—1,470 acres.

2439. And the mileage is about what?—From the boundary about two miles square—about a mile and four-fifths from north to south, and two miles across.

2440. Statute miles?—Yes.

2441. Now, I would just ask you some leading particulars with regard to the operations of the Commissioners, since their incorporation in '47, with regard to the water works, how were steps taken to construct water works?—Yes.

2442. After the Act of '47 was passed?—Not till '51.

2443. And had you then the advice of Mr. Balmain, the eminent engineer, in the construction of these water works?—Yes; at that time the Board consulted Mr. Balmain, and they sent me over to London to consult with reference to it, and it was under his plans the work was carried out.

2444. I believe these works were completed in 1843?—Yes, they were opened in '53.

2445. And that, I believe, Mr. Evans, was some six or seven years before the Corporation?—Yes.

2446. Now, the cost of these works, am I right in saying, was £17,800?—That is the amount.

2447. And it is well to remember that, for it makes a difference when the cost of distribution is considered. The subsequent addition to the township made it desirable to extend the works?—Yes; Rathgar was added, and it was not contemplated in the works; it was stated there would be fair pressure in that district, but we found we had to construct increased works.

2448. In what year was that done?—In '74.

2449. And what was the cost?—£11,000.

2450. So that the total expenditure in respect of water works was, in round numbers, £39,800?—Yes.

2451. Now, Mr. Evans, I believe £9,000 of that has been paid off?—It has been paid off in sinking fund.

2452. And I take it your existing debt is in round numbers £30,000?—Yes; £18,000 to private parties, and £22,000 to the Treasury.

2453. That is the Board of Works?—Yes.

2454. These private individuals then, were so well satisfied with the security that they took the bulk of it?—They took it all. Under the sinking fund arrangement that debt will be exhausted in twenty-seven years. The interest for the first seven years was at the rate of 4 per cent., and at the end of seven years it was reduced to 4½ per cent.

2455. Now, in the year 1877, were you desirous to arrange with the Corporation for the purpose of getting some additional water supply?—There was a desire on the part of some members of the Board to treat with the Corporation for a supply of Vandy.

2456. Did you succeed in making an arrangement?—After several meetings with the Water Works Committee, arrangements were made, and terms were agreed on, which were recommended by the Water Works Committee and the City Engineer. The whole arrangement, however, dropped through, not being approved of by the Council.

2457. Have you at present under consideration a scheme for an additional supply for yourselves?—Yes; it is under the consideration of the Board, under the advice of Mr. Hassard.

2458. Who has charge of the drainage scheme?—Yes.

2459. Well now I will take your drainage operations since the Act of '47, give the expenditure on drainage altogether, apart from your expenditures in '77, or under the Act of '77?—The sum expended in drainage was about £6,000 and odd, but that by no means represents the amount expended on drainage, for we took up no private road, no road to be devoted to the

speculation of building purposes, without it being thoroughly drained by the proprietor in the first instance.

2460. And then in addition to the Commissioners expending that £6,000 the roads must be sewered and paved?—Yes.

2461. And I need not ask does not that operation involve considerable additional outlay?—Yes; I should think that £6,000 should be supplemented by nearly £12,000; one road alone, I think, cost £600 for the sewerage of it.

2462. We know the history of the attempt to have a joint drainage scheme with the Corporation, and how it fell through, but you obtained an Act in 1877, enabling Penrhos and Rathmines to drain their own district?—Yes; in 1877.

2463. And as you are aware the Corporation opposed that?—Yes; in the Lords.

2464. But their opposition was not successful, and you got your Bill?—Yes.

2465. £100,000 is the expenditure you are entitled to?—Just so.

2466. Mr. Heron.—£100,000 for Rathmines?

Mr. Evans.—No; for the joint township.

2467. Mr. Andrews.—And I believe promptly after you got that Bill passed, and when it got the Royal assent, you set about getting plans, and looked for tenders?—Immediately.

2468. And on the 7th of May, '78, a tender was received for the construction of the works?—Yes.

2469. Can you give the amount of the accepted tender?—£69,380. I should mention that I am clerk to the Board.

2470. Was that tender a little under Mr. Hassard's estimate?—Yes.

2471. He was acting for the two townships?—Yes. He prepared the estimate for the Parliamentary Committee. The tenders ranged from £62,000 up to £80,000.

2472. Since entering into that contract has considerable progress been made with the work?—Yes, about two and a half miles have nearly been completed up to the present.

2473. And I believe the total length does not exceed four and a half miles?—That is the length.

2474. So that I may say fully one-half has been completed?—Yes.

2475. Now, as Mr. Heron very properly wished to know with reference to the other, the loan requisite for that purpose, at what rate of interest has the debenture stock been taken up?—Four per cent. About £23,000 or £24,000 of that debenture stock has been taken up by the public—as much, in fact, as we wanted up to the present.

2476. And, as I understand, the Corporation might, had they gone on, have taken advantage of that scheme for the discharge of their sewerage?—Yes, it was considered by a member of the Drainage Board, who was a member of the Corporation—it was fully considered, and a clause in the agreement was made with the contractor.

2477. But it has not been made available by the Corporation, and you proceeded with your works?—The Corporation were limited to the month of November that year to carry it out.

2478. CHAIRMAN.—Was that to carry the drainage of the south side to Poolbeg?—Yes, the suggestion came from members of the Corporation.

2479. Mr. Andrews.—As to paving, scavenging, and watering of your roads and avenues, has that work been fairly attended to since your township was formed?—Yes, as far as the resources permit, and as far as the Board are enabled they do it—we pave and keep the roads.

2480. Do you obtain the best materials?—Yes, we do.

2481. Do you settle your accounts monthly?—We do.

2482. And does that naturally conduce to your get-

ting your materials, &c., on the best terms?—Yes, we always find it so.

2483. Though you are the Secretary, I may ask you how do these roads and avenues contract with Dublin?—In my opinion very well—very favourably.

2484. I believe you have had from time to time to do whatever was requisite for the footpath, including the use of asphalt wherever it could be well applied?—Yes, that is so.

2485. Now, a few questions as to your sanitary condition. Have the Commissioners availed themselves of the powers of the Sanitary Act after they got them?—They have.

2486. And when their sanitary powers were increased did they avail themselves of those increased powers?—Yes.

2487. Do you disinfect for all persons applying to you for the purpose of disinfection?—Yes.

2488. And do you adopt the more certain course of burning infected clothing?—Yes, wherever necessary or recommended by our medical officer.

2489. It was stated in the course of the case, during the evidence given for the Corporation, that some of your inhabitants come from the township to Dublin to get matters done for them, which they could not have done in Rathmines—that they are, in point of fact, obliged to come to Dublin after being refused by us?—They never were refused by us. It is right to add, however, that there is no doubt in a district like Rathmines there would be parties who would rather apply to the city to get it done, to have clothes disinfected, fearing that their case or circumstances in the matter should be known to their neighbours. I do remember a circumstance of that kind.

2490. Before the last Public Health Act was in force, which required a vehicle to be available for the conveyance of patients, did you find the union vehicle was adequate for the purpose?—Yes, quite.

2491. And have you now ordered a vehicle under the provisions of the Act?—Yes; in fact it is mandatory to do so.

2492. And the necessary directions have been given?—Yes.

2493. CHAIRMAN.—Was it not mandatory under the Act of 1865?—No; the Local Government Board never called on us.

2494. CHAIRMAN.—Never called on you! but the word in the Act I know is "may," and "may" has been construed to mean "must"!—I never heard that it was to be done, only if the Local Government Board required you to provide it—in fact that you were to wait for their directions.

2495. Mr. Andrews.—At all events, you have ordered one now, and you say that previously you found the union one was ample for your purpose?—Ample; in point of fact we had not half a dozen cases in the year.

2496. Now, Mr. Evans, as to the death-rate—make me mind evidence on this point will probably be given by another witness, but I would ask you to give the Commissioners the average death-rate per thousand?—It is about 19-20.

2497. Now, will you take the exceptionally severe winter through which we have passed; what was it?—Twenty-two.

2498. And what was Dublin?—Twenty-eight, twenty-nine, and thirty, I think.

2499. CHAIRMAN.—I believe it was even up to 50.

2500. Mr. Andrews.—Now what was the average of the city?—I think it went up to thirty, but you will have that given more particularly.

2501. How many slaughter-houses have you in the township?—Five.

2502. Are those attended to and inspected regularly?—Yes, they are.

2503. They are under the supervision and care of the sub-sanitary office, I believe?—Yes.

2504. CHAIRMAN.—Have you any bye-laws for the regulation of these slaughter-houses?—No; we have not.

DEBATE.
May 18, 1879.
Mr. John H.
Evans.

DENISON,
May 19, 1878.
Mr. John H.
Evans.

2505. CHAIRMAN.—How or when were they licensed?—In 1848 they were licensed.

2506. If you have no bye-laws, how have you any control over them?—There is no difficulty whatever in connection with them—either with their management or arrangement no difficulty arises.

2507. Mr. COTTON.—Have they formal licenses?—Yes; they were licensed in '48.

2508. Mr. ANDREWS.—As a matter of fact, are your slaughter-houses clean and well regulated?—Yes.

2509. Now, as to the gas, you got it from the same source as Duthlin?—Yes, we had a contract with the Alliance Gas Company from the time of our incorporation.

2510. Are you afflicted with any great outbreak of fires in your township?—I am thankful to say we are not. There have been one or two heavy ones, but I may say, speaking generally, that there are little or no fires in Bathurst.

2511. During the evidence given on the part of the Corporation, the fire that took place at the distillery was referred to, and also the fire that took place at the two mills. Now, on those occasions, was the fire brigade present?—Yes.

2512. And notwithstanding that they were burned?—Yes.

2513. And I suppose if there had been an amalgamation with the city there would have been the same result?—Yes. I may add that the attention of the staff was directed to the saving of other property—the bonded stores of the distillery, and the stores of the mills. As to the mills, I may say the case was quite hopeless from the beginning.

2514. You have a fire engine?—Yes.

2515. And you keep it constantly in order, and see to the appliances?—Yes.

2516. Give some particulars with reference to the number of houses in the township?—The total number of ratings is 5,876; of these, 3,125 are rated at £10, and 262 over £3. At £5 and under, 381; land and other ratings, £108.

2517. None of the ratings would include gate lodges?—No; most of the villa residences are provided with gate lodges.

2518. From your experience can you say if your improvement rate is higher or lower than the Corporation elsewhere in Ireland?—I think it is the lowest rate in Ireland.

2519. Do you find the rates regularly paid?—No doubt more so. In fact there is no arrear.

2520. Give the Commissioners a figure as to that point. For the past five years, say, have you got the total amount of your rate paid up?—Yes; I may almost say so. The total amount assessed was £46,363 6s. 2d.

2521. Was that for five years ending in '73?—Yes, and the total amount collected was £46,366 17s. 4d., leaving a total loss of £16 8s. 10d.

2522. That included servants?—Yes.

2523. Do you find your Board meets regularly?—Most regularly; they are extremely punctual.

2524. What is the hour of meeting?—Nine o'clock in the morning.

2525. And is that a monthly meeting?—Yes; except when there are adjournments to a particular day.

2526. And have you power of calling special or other meetings, except those monthly ones?—Yes; either by resolution or by adjournment.

2527. Have you committees looking after separate subjects?—Yes.

2528. You have three committees, I believe?—Yes. The Water and Public Health, the Roads Committee, and Finance or Audit.

2529. Do you ever have to adjourn from want of a quorum?—I have never known the Board to adjourn from want of a quorum.

2530. That is your experience?—Yes; I never knew it.

2531. And within what time do you transact busi-

ness at the monthly meetings?—An hour, or an hour and a half.

2532. Do you allow any but business topics to be introduced?—No, nothing.

2533. Are there any speeches made?—Well, occasionally there may be speeches made, but no politics or extraneous matters are ever allowed to be introduced into the proceedings.

2534. I am right in saying it would not be allowed?—No, it would not.

2535. Now, you have given the dimensions of your existing area—I believe it may be taken roughly as being about one-third of the extent of the whole city?—Yes, about that.

2536. And do you find by experience you are large enough to be able to attend to your own requirements and interests?—I don't think we could undertake more.

2537. Since you were formed into a township and were incorporated, have there been large increases of expenditure in property in the township?—Yes. It has in fact been vastly increased.

2538. Could you give something that would be a guide—some figure that would be a good deal under the mark, showing the extent of building operations since your incorporation in 1847?—It would be very difficult.

2539. CHAIRMAN.—The valuation in 1850 was £33,000, and in 1875, £22,000.

2540. Mr. ANDREWS.—That is a good test.

2541. Mr. NEVILLE.—I think Mr. Nevile has given some details as to the roads—the use of the roads by the township and the city.

2542. Mr. ANDREWS.—Do the city people use your roads?—I think, really, our roads are used as much as we use the city.

2543. Do you grow hay for cattle feeding?—Well practically there is nothing of that kind produced in the township. It must all pass from the country over the roads of the township to the city.

2544. And are these large cart loads of hay that pass in that way over the township roads?—Yes.

2545. And I may take it also that quantities of manure pass from the city through the township to the country districts?—Yes, that is equally apparent to anyone.

2546. Have you recently tried in any way to come at what I may call the import and export traffic is?—Well, since last the Commissioners met here we have tested it on three days last week, and I will give you the return.

2547. What did the test show?—About 300 tons against the townships.

2548. Do you mean of loads passing in or out—300 tons more going out of the townships than into the city?—Yes.

2549. Just give the Commissioners the total you sold the figures were taken for three days, as a test?—Yes, on the 13th, 14th, and 15th.

2550. Did you take it at three entrances, or at one place?—We took it at three places, Charlemont-street, Harcourt's-cross, and Portobello Canal bridge, these were the only three.

2551. And what was the total of the traffic that came in during these three days?—I made out the return, but I have not got it here. I know 1,385 loads of goods came in.

2552. Mr. COTTON.—Did you make any classification of goods?—They were all classes of merchandise, sacking, bricks, hay, straw, coal, &c.

2553. CHAIRMAN.—1,385 loads coming into the township from the city?—Yes.

2554. Mr. ANDREWS.—1,385 coming into the city?—No, it is the reverse. There was 1,285 coming from the city to the township, and 1,538 from through the township into the city—a difference of 300 loads.

2555. CHAIRMAN.—Is that entirely loaded wagons?—Yes.

2556. Mr. ANDREWS.—And is no way included cattle?—No. They would only come in on Thursday morning.

2557. Mr. Corriss.—Is there a large cattle traffic?—Yes.

2558. It must come in the morning very early!—Yes.

2559. Mr. Andrews.—And that I take it is not included in that return!—No.

2560. Then you have these cattle coming in and they wear your roads as much as the Dublin streets!—Yes.

2561. CHAIRMAN.—Can you say what was in the carts going into Dublin!—Mostly stones and building materials.

2562. Mr. Cotton.—And were they passing through the township from immediately outside?—The great majority. Mr. Neville gave evidence about 12,000 tons coming through of stones, but that is very small proportion of what Rathmines men bring in; there is a quarry there for building stones, all the granite too that comes from Balloch, and gravel from Green Hills, all this must pass through the township.

2563. Now, have you had an opportunity of examining the return of the City Accountant, of the 11th of April, showing the increased taxation which amalgamation would impose on Rathmines!—Yes, I have looked into it.

2564. Your present rate (including a 4d. rate for sinking fund) is 2s. 4d.—Yes.

2565. Is that the maximum you ever levied!—Yes.

2566. And it has been occasionally under 2s. 1d.—Yes.

2567. Now, as Mr. O'Donnell and other gentlemen said, the rating, taking it as a Dublin rating in this respect, will be increased!—Well, the grand jury rate Mr. Beveridge admitted will be 8d. more next year.

2568. And the 4s. 4d. Dublin rate will become 2s. 2d.—Yes, and instead of the maximum rate levied here never being higher than 2s. 4d., there would be a fixed rate of 2s. 6d., and that would be further increased if the principle of the one-fourth rating is allowed to railways, for that would reduce the large valuation.

2569. Your present rating for railways in Rathmines is what?—In Rathmines it is very little, but it is on the total.

2570. CHAIRMAN.—Your present rate is 2s. 4d. How much will the drainage bring it up to?

2571. Mr. Andrews.—That is quite a different matter. Now, Mr. Evans, the 4s. 6d. is what Rathmines will be taxed in the pound on amalgamation; have you made an estimate of what the drainage will add?—No, I have not gone into that.

2572. Now take it, Mr. Evans, that instead of 2s. 4d. the rating becomes 4s. 6d., that would be 2s. 2d. of a difference; now discard the 2s. and tell the Commissioners what additional taxation would be imposed on Rathmines?—£10,000 would be imposed by the 2s.

2573. Your valuation is about £100,000!—Yes; next year that will be the valuation about.

2574. So that 2s. in the pound means £10,000!—Yes.

2575. Now, so far as you know, will you get any return for that?—I cannot say we will.

2576. Do you know from having lived in Rathmines, and from being secretary to the Commissioners for a number of years, do you know what the feeling is in Rathmines amongst the ratepayers and people generally?—It is decidedly against amalgamation; both the Board and the ratepayers are of that opinion.

2577. Do you expect to be able to give the Commissioners some more accurate figures, or rather some details, showing what the feeling is?—I hope to do so to-morrow evening. I had it ready, but wished to give any one outside an opportunity of making remarks.

2578. If you have any details or figures I would ask you to bring them to-morrow!—I shall.

2579. When you have your drainage carried out are you aware of any public works of consequence you require in Rathmines?—Not that I am aware of.

2580. Is the dispensary district substantially coterminous with the township?—It is; the township is the dispensary district.

2581. That little spot on the map of '63, and so marked, belongs to Dennybrook!—Yes.

2582. Are they substantially in the same electoral division?—Yes, all except that little bit.

2583. And you are outside the Parliamentary boundary?

Cross-examined by Mr. Heron, Q.C.

2584. Does the Board hold its meetings in public?—No.

2585. And I believe it never did!—No, it never did.

2586. And what is the reason of that?—The Board don't wish it.

2587. But what is the reason the Board don't wish it?—They would never get through their business if the meetings were open to the press. Publicity of that kind would be wrong, and would certainly serve no good purpose.

2588. The Board have power on a vacancy arising of electing a new member!—Yes, under the "Commissioners Clause Act."

2589. And they invariably exercise it?—Well, yes, always.

2590. Now, are the accounts audited by a Government auditor, and how long have they been so audited?—For the last two years they have been audited by the Government auditor.

2591. Why were they not so audited before that?—Under the Rathmines Act we were not bound to do so, and the ratepayers themselves always had the election of two auditors, and always elected them.

2592. There was not a public audit before that?—It was the Act of '74 that first required a public audit of the township accounts.

2593. Before that was the public audit resisted by the Board?

2594. Was it resisted by any one?—No, there was a requisition from the ratepayers to adopt a public audit, and the Board acquiesced in it, and called the meeting to adopt a public audit.

2595. What is now the total expense as regards salaries of the offices of the Commissioners?—They are limited to 10 per cent. on the rates.

2596. How much is paid now in salaries?—For what year?

2597. Take '78!—£800.

2598. And in '77!—£792—a large margin under 10 per cent.

2599. Have you more offices than one under the Commissioners?—I am clerk to the Draining Board.

2600. As regards the water of Rathmines, are there complaints about it?—I am told there are, but no matter what water you supply you will always have complaints about it; many people object to the Variety.

2601. On the ground of it being too pure?—No, you will get no number of ratepayers to agree completely on the subject of the water supplied to them.

2602. Do you think the water of the canal is proper and adequate for the supply of the township?—If you ask me as an individual I say I am quite satisfied with it.

2603. But is it?—It is.

2604. There are a great many basis on it!—The analysis of it, which you have here, was made by Dr. Cameron, Dr. Bell, and Professor Reynolds.

2605. Well, I see that Dr. Cameron says!—

"The results of the examination of this water prove that it contains a much smaller amount of organic impurities than the quantity which, in the opinion of the best authorities on the subject, should render water unuseable. The degree of impurity of a water," &c.

That is Dr. Cameron's opinion.

2606. My Andrews—Read the first part of the analysis.

"At the request of the Grand Canal Company I have made an analysis of the pipe-water supplied to Rathmines, and the source of which is the Grand Canal. I took the water from the tap in the Commissioners' house, Rathmines

BIRMINGHAM,
May 18, 1882.
Mr. John H.
Evans.

Dissent.
May 12, 1878.

Mr. John H.
Evans.

(and is doing so adopted all the precautions usual on such occasions), on the 11th inst., at 10.30 o'clock. Physical properties of the water, specific gravity, 1.00045. Perfectly transparent and colourless, hardly a trace of suspended matter (showing excellent filtration). No peculiar flavour or odour. Neither acid nor alkaline. After standing for twenty-four hours no sediment was deposited from the water: chemical composition. An imperial gallon (70,000 grains weight) contained 17,930 grains total solid matter, of which 12,43 were precipitated on the water being boiled. The solid matters contain the following:—
He then proceeds to analyse its chemical composition, and concludes as follows:—

"The amount of nitrogen acids (products of the oxidation of ammonia) is extremely minute, so far as chemical analysis enables us to form an opinion as to the freedom of water from sewage, and similar pollutions, the results of present analysis are altogether in favour of the Rathmines pipe-water. I should, however, add that the water is hard."

2607. Mr. Heron.—Well, Mr. Evans, you are altogether in favour of the equal water!—Well, I won't say that. It suits me; but as I said, you will have complaint of soy water, however good it may be.

2608. There was a reduction of valuation in 1852!—Yes.

2609. Why was that reduction made?—It was a Government move. I can't say why it was. There was a similar reduction made in the city, but I cannot give the reason. We were sorry for it, for it reduced our income.

2610. The Rathmines people did not want it to be done?—No; that was a matter, however, that I don't think we would be consulted about.

2611. What salary has the Sanitary Inspector?—£50.

2612. And your Sub sanitary Officer?—£15 he gets. That is only for serving notices and that.

2613. Are these the persons who inspect the slaughter-houses?—Yes; the sub-sanitary officer principally does that.

2614. The slaughter-houses are now under the Contagious Diseases (Animals) Act?—Yes.

2615. But as regards your inspection,?—It is done by the sub-sanitary officer.

2616. Now as to the state of the roads, you think them perfect?—Nearly so.

2617. No complaints at all about them!—Very seldom; but, just as in the case of the water, you cannot please everyone.

2618. And as to your sanitary arrangements?—Just the same, you can't please everyone; and we frequently have complaints.

2619. Have you estimated what the rate will be as regards the main drainage scheme?—Well, the rate for this year struck was 6d. in the pound. It may be 5d. next year, but it cannot pass dd.

2620. Now, how much will your houses in Rathmines have to pay?—It is a joint payment.

2621. Is it an equal share?—No, it is a poundage rate.

2622. How much will it be?—It will not exceed 6d.

2623. How much for the contract works for main drainage will Rathmines have to pay?—£70,000 will it be?—Oh, nothing like that. Pembroke will have to pay a separate charge, and there it may go up to 9d., being liable for extra work.

2624. How much will it be?—I cannot say. Pembroke is liable for pumping engines and other additional charges in connection with their works. I cannot give correct or exact data.

2625. CHAIRMAN.—Has Pembroke to pay for pumping in addition?—Yes, because Rathmines does not require to use pumping engines. It is caused by the difference in the level of Pembroke which causes it to be used.

2626. Now, tell me where all the accounts of the Commissioners filed regularly from the commencement?—Yes.

2627. And were all audited by the two private auditors?—Yes.

2628. The waterworks, as I understand, cost altogether £25,000!—Yes.

2629. But that includes the whole expenditure of laying down the pipes?—Yes, work and everything.

2630. Where exactly?—I have never been at them—where exactly in the filter bed?—At Gallantstown, four and a half miles, just beyond Clondalkin.

2631. Are there large reservoirs there?—Yes, and filter beds—six filter beds—on the same plan as the Vartsy; in fact, it was Mr. Bateman prepared the plans of both.

2632. And is the pressure sufficient?—Yes, except in some places in the township.

2633. In some places it is not sufficient, I suppose?—Yes; in some places it is not up to the higher stories of the houses. Builders will put their cisterns and water-closets at the top of the house.

2634. Mr. Heron.—That is natural.

2635. CHAIRMAN.—What is the maximum pressure, can you say?—I cannot say. I think about eighty feet.

2636. Mr. Heron.—Do you consider your arrangements for fires with your staff and with your pressure of water are sufficient—what staff have you?—Twenty men.

2637. What are they?—They are a staff of week-men.

2638. You don't call them firemen?—No. There is the Inspector.

2639. Are they under any obligation to get up in the middle of the night to attend a fire?—No, but they do.

2640. Or in the middle of the day—is there any obligation on them to get up then?—No.

2641. Then, in point of fact, there is no one to work the engines if a fire breaks out?—There is our staff and our Inspector; he is the principal man to do it.

2642. What is he exactly?—Our waterworks Inspector.

2643. Is he a trained officer—has he been trained to this sort of work?—He is as good a man as there is in the city of Dublin.

2644. What salary is he paid?—£150 a year.

2645. Has he got men trained to the business of a fire brigade under him?—There are about half a dozen quite conversant with it.

2646. How would you summon them in case of an outbreak of fire?—There is a bell.

2647. And do these men live in the neighbourhood?—Yes, most of them; and the Inspector is authorized to hire as many men as he likes.

2648. And that is the only organization there is?—That is the organization.

2649. The only organization for sanitary purposes you have is the man who gets £50 a year—what kind of a man is he at all?—He is an ex-sergeant of police, and has a pension of £50 a year.

2650. CHAIRMAN.—But has he a pension because he served out his time in the police, and was wounded out, in fact—is that the way it is?

2651. Mr. Evans.—The Local Government Board would not sanction his appointment if he were not a right and proper man for the office.

2652. Mr. Heron.—How long was he in the police—was he forty years?—I cannot say.

2653. Was he thirty years?—I cannot say.

2654. Was he a sergeant?—Yes; he was a sergeant.

2655. What does he do now in connection with these sanitary duties in the way of inspection?—Well, he attends to all complaints coming in; sees to all the lanes in the township; sees after the omnibuses, whatever they are, wherever they occur.

2656. There are twenty-two miles of roads!—Yes; but not twenty-two miles of lanes.

2657. I know; but does he only see after the lanes?—He sees after wherever the nuisance may be.

2658. How is it you come to pay only £15 a year to this other man you mentioned—it is a very small salary!—Well, he is the porter in the Town Hall.

2659. Has he sleeping apartments there?—Yes.

2660. Has he anything extra as porter—is he paid anything else?—He has 16s. a week. The £15 a year is only for serving notices and so on.

2661. And do you really think that one man is quite sufficient for the work of inspection?—Yes, and it is the opinion of our Public Health Committee. The fact of the matter is the notices are served, and there is scarcely ever any difficulty whatever arises in the case. We have not, I may say, ten prosecutions a year.

2662. Now, do you think the organisation of the fire brigade, such as you have described it to Mr. Andrews and Mr. Heron, is enough?—Yes; I may say that in 1863 our Board supported the Bill proposed by the Dublin Corporation, and an arrangement was made with the late Sir John Gray, but never carried out, to the effect that Ruthmores should have the benefit of the Dublin Fire Brigade on a £15 contribution to every fire attended by them.

2663. Do you not think it would be advisable for all the townships to combine with the Corporation for one fire brigade?—I think that Captain Ingram's evidence went to show that no small township could keep up a fire brigade—that it would be too expensive.

2664. Mr. Heron.—Yes; for it is the teaching and training of these men that is necessary and proves of use at a fire. Now, as to the gas, what arrangements have you?—A yearly rate per lamp for the light, and including lamp-posts, repairs, and everything.

2665. And has that been decreased or increased of late?—Decreased.

2666. CHAIRMAN.—How much is it?—£2 12s. a lamp. It is £1,000 a year about.

2667. CHAIRMAN.—Yea; £1,015 I see it is stated. That would be about 2d. or 3d. in the £?—About 3d.

2668. Then you make no arrangement about supplying private persons?—No.

2669. They get their supply from the Gas Company?—Yes; we have powers under the Act of Parliament to construct gasworks ourselves, and at one time my Board were thinking of going in for it, but we found that though we had ample powers to construct gasworks ourselves, it would never pay.

2670. You had only power to manufacture for yourselves?—Yes.

2671. The tram lines are kept in repair for you by the Tram Company?—Yes, no doubt.

2672. And the heavy traffic goes nearly always on the pavement of the tram lines?—Well, I cannot say that. I dare say the heavy traffic does, but the carts and carts that go on it have to get so frequently out of the way of the tram cars that I think I may say they go as much upon the other parts of the roadway.

2673. Do you think macadamising is suitable for the bye-ways?—I certainly do not think paving suitable for suburban districts.

2674. Mr. Heron.—You have no by-laws whatever for these slaughter-houses?—No.

2675. Do you yourself know anything particular about the inspection of these slaughter-houses?—No.

2676. Does this policeman go to them for the purposes of inspection?—Yes.

2677. This disinfecting process of which we have heard, is it a hot chamber?—No; it is by actual immuring the disinfection is caused.

2678. Then how much did you burn in '78, on an average?—I believe there were only two cases.

2679. CHAIRMAN.—And how much in '77?—None. We were not subject, thank God, to the epidemic in '77. If there were fifty cases, however, they would be attended to.

2680. Mr. Cotton.—You say you had only two cases in '78?—Yes, that is all. That was all. They were the only cases reported by our medical officer calling for our intervention.

2681. Mr. Heron.—What salary does the medical officer get?—He is the dispensary doctor, and he is consulting medical officer to the Board.

2682. And what do you pay him for that?—£25;

that is all the Local Government allow. They put a limit on the salary.

2683. CHAIRMAN.—What was the total expenditure last year?—I find under the head of salaries, £27 10s. Sewage, £15 7s.

2684. Now, was that all you spent in that year?—That was on sewage works. We had to get the consent of the Local Government Board. (We receive half of the amount in respect of salaries.) The works we had to get their sanction to. The fee to Mr. Husband, we could only give that under the sanction of the Local Government Board.

2685. Now, about the meetings of the Board, is it not a fact that you don't allow business to be transacted after 10 o'clock?—No, that is quite a mistake; we don't allow new matters to be gone into after that hour.

2686. That is, any matter not disposed of at 10 o'clock, and that comes on after that hour, is not discussed or considered by the Board?—No; if there is no notice of it.

2687. Mr. Stokes in his evidence before the Select Committee, states that no new business is gone into after 10 o'clock?—Yes; that is, after five or ten minutes after 10 o'clock no member could stand up and speak open or introduce a new subject of which no notice had been given.

2688. Mr. Stokes says that practically the business is over at 10 o'clock, because no new business is to be gone into after that hour?—Yes; but new business means a member starting up to discuss a subject of which he had not given any notice.

2689. How many members of your Board who carry on their business in Dublin, and have their place of residence in Rathmines?—Nearly all.

2690. Is not that the reason, as Mr. Stokes states, that you have your meetings at 9 o'clock, and from that until 10 to allow those gentlemen to go into their places of business?—Yes; for we would not get a regular meeting in the middle of the day.

2691. Then I take it that all the members are men in business in Dublin who go in every morning to their daily business?—Yes.

2692. Now, I take it your maximum rate, except with consent of the ratepayers, is 2s. i—Yes.

2693. How do you divide it, is not that 1s. for paving and lighting?—We never divide it that way.

2694. How do you make out your 2s.—you, as necessary to the Board, ought to know?—We prepare an estimate at the beginning of the year.

2695. Yes, but I want to work it out and have a certain reason for the rate being that amount. There are two audited accounts for the years ending March '77 and '78; how did you divide the rate for each?—how is it made up?—We make no division.

2696. But you must make an estimate; you cannot say I want 1s. and no more?—We estimate first of all the first item, which is the Grand Jury.

2697. What is that?—It is a varying rate.

2698. But you see the Treasurer of the Grand Jury sends in a requisition for as much, in lieu of county at large charges—Mr. Stokes says it is 6d. t—That is only an approximate estimate.

2699. Well, I want to see how you are living, if I may say so, on 2s. at all; you know you must have some way of doing it?—I will explain it. We take our estimate; the first item appears to be the Grand Jury—we know how much that is.

2700. That is 6d. t—We don't take it at 6d., we take it in the bulk.

2701. Give it, then, for 1877?—£3,001 7s. 6d.

2702. That would give you over 6d. in the £?—It would not in this way.

2703. Well, I want the details you know?—We never take details what we do.

2704. CHAIRMAN.—You give me, I think, £1,000 to be equal to a 3d. rate; so I may take it that £3,001 is equal to 6d.; now the next would be public lighting?—That is 3d.

2705. How much for water?—4d. I think it is—No; 7s.

DUBLIN.
May 10, 1879.
Mr. John B.
Evans.

BUCKINGHAM.
May 25, 1880.
Mr. John H.
Evans.

2706. Well, 7d. for water, and salaries 6d., that is 1s. 10d., leaving 2d. for scavenging, cleaning the roads and streets, and so on—that is all that is left out of your 2s.; if I include printing, law costs, furniture, &c., you have not a penny left out of the 2s.—It has been done, that is all I can say.

2707. But how did you do it; you have a 2s. rate, and that is your maximum, and you stick to it; what I want to know is how it is expended. In both these years there was 2s. 4d.—4d. was for sewage—that was by consent, I presume!—That is for sinking fund and interest.

2708. I have here in 1877, the account of the Dublin Grand Jury levying £2,001 7s. 6d., that is equivalent to a 6d. rating; the next is the Alliance Gas Public Lighting, £1,015 3s., that is equal to 3d.; then there is the water, equal to 7d.; and 6d. for salaries; but you must take 4d. off that for Sinking Fund and interest—there is rent, taxes, fees, and incidental expenses, £30 3s. 6d.; law and Parliamentary expenses, I think, £33 8s., repairs of premises, £7 10d., and other items. Now, if you look at that and tell me you will see that you have about 1s. 10d., so that there is just 2d. left for the paving and scavenging of your streets. In one year I see the salaries and emoluments amounted to about £792 10s., and in '78, to £695; so you have, as I say, just 2d., or, taking it at 2s. 4d., you have 6d. for paving and scavenging your township. If you can explain that away to me do so!—We never calculated an estimate at poundage rates.

2709. But what I want is the poundage rate!—If you give me until to-morrow I will do that; I will calculate it in the meantime.

2710. Certainly, that is all I want. What struck me was this: I find that Mr. Stokes was asked by the Chairman how much of the 2s. rate goes to the paving and lighting, and he put it down at about 1s.—1s. paving and lighting; 6d. Grand Jury; 2d. for sewage and sanitary purposes?

2711. Mr. Evans.—This is the evidence of Mr. Stokes in '76, but the valuation has increased nearly £5,000 or £7,000 since then.

2712. CHAIRMAN.—But that after all won't alter it; take your own account, you add £1,000 represented 3d., and on a calculation of what is required for the various purposes set out in the account, I brought it out at 1s. 10d., and that leaves you 2d.—I will bring it out for you to-morrow morning—the poundage rate.

2713. You never had the consent of the inhabitants to put on more than 2s. 4d.—We never asked them, the 4d. was for sinking fund and interest.

2714. Now, tell me this, do you think that for a township like Bathmains in 1877, £23 1s. 6d. to be expended on sewage alone, was sufficient?—I have given my evidence, and all I can say is that the sewage works are all done.

2715. And is it to expend £23 1s. 6d. you have a staff with salaries amounting to £127 odd?

2716. Mr. Newark C. Bentley.—I think the Secretary forgot to mention that there are a variety of contributions independent of the 2s. or 2s. 4d. rate.

2717. CHAIRMAN.—The only thing under the head of sanitary rate is to pay salaries, amounting to £120 odd.

2718. Mr. Evans.—I may say about the £23 1s. 6d., that was owing to certain law proceedings taken in respect of premises in Mountpleasant-avenue, where the sewers were not properly completed, and that sum was expended in these proceedings to compel the work to be done. There is a sum of £45 odd in the account of '78 for a similar thing.

2719. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, and this shows, as far as I can see, everything expended for the sanitary work of Bathmains, except paying salaries.

2720. I forget how many houses you said are in Bathmains!—There are 5,875 ratings; 10% of these are of land.

2721. What proportion do the railways pay?—The full proportion.

2722. CHAIRMAN.—You said, in answer to Mr. Andrews, that as far as the resources would allow, and as far as the Board could do it, you paved and kept the streets as well as you could!—Yes.

2723. Do you know what the roads cost?—About £3,000—from £3,000 to £3,000 a year.

2724. As regards the carrying out of the sanitary work, you have this one Inspector!—Yes.

2725. This ex-sergeant!—Yes.

2726. And do you have a sub-servant officer?—Yes.

2727. And do you think that is sufficient?—I don't know if we had any more what they would be doing.

2728. With all the refuse thrown out by the shops, with so many lanes and by-places to look after!—He sees that the refuse is carted away from these shops, and is not allowed to accumulate, and all the necessary steps are taken to prevent nuisances continuing.

2729. But how can he see to lanes—to all the lanes and back places in the district, comprising so many miles of road?—He has no right to go into private places.

2730. No right to go into private places! Is there a monthly or even a half-yearly inspection of drifts in private places or of the lanes. Do you, as a matter of fact, or does your Inspector know whether a nuisance exists in one of these places?—Yes.

2731. How does he know if he makes no inspection?—But complaint is made.

2732. Complaint made—that is when the smell gets so bad that it is intolerable. You get private complaints, no doubt, but have you any one to go about and see the back lanes and places, and enter the premises and see how they are kept?—Yes, there is the Inspector.

2733. A man for £50 a year to have charge of twenty-two miles of roads and by-places in a township like Bathmains. It is one thing to have only a 1s. rate, and not carry out the terms of the Act of Parliament, but if you had the proper efforts to carry it out it would be far more in accordance with what one would expect in such a district!—It is sufficient.

2734. These houses that were mentioned—300, I think, fit for artisans—are there any of the lower classes of people live in these houses?—They are of the labouring class; they are in the lanes of the township.

2735. And there are no complaints regarding the state of these houses?—Very seldom. Whatever there is a complaint it is attended to.

2736. Are there pigs kept there?—No, they are not allowed to be there when they are overcrowded—they are not along with human beings.

2737. But are they in the back places?—Yes.

2738. And is that carrying out the Act?—Well, the magistrates won't fine, and what are we to do? We have more trouble from the magistrates than from the police. I may mention that, owing to an injudicious decision of Mr. O'Donnell, there was an epidemic tertian in one part of our district. We proceeded, and had a great deal of trouble in a case, but he would not hear the case; he would not allow our sub-servant officer to come into court.

2739. CHAIRMAN.—Until he was disinfected.

2740. Mr. Evans.—As to pigs, I know the usual order made in court was to have them removed within a month. Well, the people only fastened the pigs in that time, but the Board did not in those cases get the assistance they should from the magistrates.

2741. I don't think there was half a dozen, but, as I have said, unless people complained the cases never got to the police court.

2742. Do artisans, or a large number of them, live in Bathmains?—Yes.

2743. I thought you said the houses which you men-

sitioned as suitable to artisans were occupied by labourers!—Yes, labourers and artisans.

2744. Masons and plumbers, and so on!—Yes. If you take the better class of artisans, you have 282 of these houses up to nearly £10 a year.

2745. Did you make any calculation of the quantity of coal driven over the Dublin streets into Rathmines!—No; but I am sure there is an equivalent in the shape of produce coming in.

2746. Mr. Hawn.—From the township!—No, but from the districts outside, and passing through the township.

2747. CHAIRMAN.—Do you agree with Mr. Stakra in saying that there are on the Board some of the first citizens of Dublin, who would not come to the meetings if they were not allowed to go to their business at 10 o'clock, or shortly after!—I don't think they would be confined to 10 o'clock.

2748. He says, at question 2145, that they could leave at 10 o'clock sharp, so that any gentlemen might go away with the certainty that no business would be originated after he goes!—That is, without previous notice having been given.

2749. Are you aware that there is a disparity in the poor rate in Dalkey and with you!—Yes; I am a poor law guardian, and am fully aware of it.

2750. Mr. Corcoran.—Has the question of bringing in Turnpike been before your Board!—No; not before my Board.

2751. Did Terence ever make application!—No.

2752. They never requested to be included!—No.

2753. Of Milltown!—Yes; I believe Milltown was included in the Bill of '47, but Mr. Tighe Hamilton, a large owner of land at Milltown Park, was in decided opposition to it, and said he would be satisfied if he was omitted. Nothing, however, was done with regard to it since.

2754. Did you ever entertain the idea of annexation, so far as it was concerned, against!—It was mooted, but nothing was done in respect of it.

2755. Would you propose to follow the river Liffey, and take in this very large and populous district of Terenure, which lately sought to get a Bill for itself?—If such a recommendation came from this Commission, my Board would favourably consider it.

2756. Will your Board suggest it!—Well, we make no suggestions.

2757. Now, with reference to this water supply, have you hydrants!—Yes.

2758. And plenty of hose!—Yes.

2759. What do you say is the highest pressure you have!—About eighty feet.

2760. And is that sufficient!—Yes; except in a small portion of our district.

2761. You heard Captain Ingram say that, in order to carry out the Fire Brigade for the townships, he would require to have a larger staff. Would you think it right that the Corporation should be called upon to have that for the benefit of the townships, and only get a contribution of £15 or so for each fire they attended; because, you know, fires may break out at any time? Would you think the Brigade should be in that way available for the purposes of Pembroke and Rathmines, and that these districts should only be called upon to give a gratuity or fixed payment of, say £15 for each fire!—I think my Board would favourably consider any proposition for a fire brigade contribution.

DUBLIN,
May 19, 1869.
Mr. John H.
Evans

2762. Have your Board considered the question of the streets of the city, which are used so much by the people of the townships! The legislature has imposed a bridge tax. Has your Board considered whether it would not be a reasonable proposition that the townships should at least contribute something towards the maintenance, repairs, and scavenging of these roads and streets, which they use so much, and to the wear and tear of which they may fairly be supposed to contribute! Have they considered whether, if you were not annexed, that would be fair!—I think it would be very unequal and unfair to ask the townships to subscribe.

2763. Legislation has already compelled them to contribute to the bridge tax!—Ah, well, that is quite an exceptional obligation. It is not levied in counties or townlands, but on the whole county. The building of bridges is quite an exceptional matter.

2764. Yes, but the legislature did not put it on the whole of the county, but over the Metropolitan police district, plus Clontarf and Drumcondra. If a man is made to pay for the use of the bridges, would it not be fair to ask him to pay something for the streets that lead to those bridges!—I have already said that I consider the bridges an exceptional case.

2765. You can't get to the bridges without going through the streets!—Of course, just as you cannot get to the city without going over the roads.

2766. Mr. Mark C. Beatty.—As Mr. Evans is to be here to-morrow, I would ask him to bring with him some correspondence I have had with him on sanitary matters. I suppose his examination is now over, but I would wish that the correspondence we have had should be laid before the Commissioners.

2767. CHAIRMAN.—What is it about?

2768. Mr. Beatty.—It is on the sanitary state of the township, and as Mr. Evans is to be here, as I understand, it will probably be convenient for him to produce it. A large number of gentlemen from Rathmines intend being here to offer their evidence.

2769. CHAIRMAN.—I forgot, I think, to ask you, Mr. Evans, what exactly is the number of your scavenging staff in Rathmines!

2770. Mr. Evans.—Our scavenging staff comprises an average number of twenty men.

2771. And how many horses have you!—We employ eight horses.

2772. Are these portions of the staff you rely upon in case of fire!—Yes.

2773. By the bye, who keeps charge of the hose—who sees that it is in order in case anything should call for its use!—There are two men.

2774. Are they specially deputed to do that!—Yes, they are not apart by the water inspector.

2775. What class of men are they!—How do you mean?

2776. What position or class of men would you describe them as belonging to!—Oh, they are labouring men.

2777. And who looks after them and sees that they do take care of the hose, and that they know the use of it and the hydrants!—They are men this long time at it, and well experienced.

2778. Are they ever taken out and drilled, these men who act as a fire brigade!—No, but regularly the hose is oiled and kept in an efficient, proper state.

The inquiry was then adjourned until next morning at eleven o'clock.

DUBLIN.—EIGHTH DAY, MAY 20TH, 1879.

DUBLIN,
May 20, 1879,

Mr. Andrews.—I wish to give you details of the 2s. rate to which reference was made yesterday, and Mr. Evans has prepared those details for the years 1877 and 1878. I will have copies made which will explain satisfactorily, I think, to you the manner in

which the rate is made up. Mr. Evans, be good enough to explain to the Chairman the mode in which for the two years I have mentioned this 2s. rate is made up.
[Details of rate handed in. Appendix No. 18.]

Mr. J. H.
Evans

Mr. J. H. EVANS RE-EXAMINED.

2739. **Chairman.**—Mr. Walker, from these accounts made up by Mr. Evans it would appear that in 1877 you expended 2d. altogether on the roads and scavenging, and then, doing that, it left you a 1½d. in the £1 in debt; so that really there was only 7½d. to pay for keeping up the roads and scavenging. In the next year, 1878, you expended exactly 7½d. also in roads and scavenging; that was, in fact, all you had to expend.

Mr. Andrews.—But we did the work.

Mr. Walker.—People prefer not to spend money on medicine unless they want it.

Mr. Andrews.—We will have copies of these returns made for you.

2740. **Dr. Norwood.**—Could you, Mr. Evans, furnish these returns a little further back?

Walker.—I can furnish them from 1845, if you wish.

2741. **Mr. Heron.**—Is there not a map of the sewers in the Rathmines district?—These maps are on the table.

2742. Is there one in existence?—Oh, yes.

2743. Of all the sewers?—Yes; they are under the Surveyor's department.

2744. **Chairman.**—Are they kept in the Town Hall, for the inspection of the public?—Yes.

2745. Is in the case of buildings at this moment in Rathmines, are the parties obliged to, and do they submit their plans, particularly of the sewerage of such buildings, to the surveyor?—In the case of houses being built near the edges of streets they do, but in general the Board have not asked builders to submit their plans.

2746. Don't you know that that is a most important thing, because with reference to the system of sewerage the surveyor should take care that they shall make their houses and drains in such a manner as to communicate with existing or intended sewerage?—That is under the Public Health Act of 1878.

2747. Under the older acts also you will find that the surveyor was bound to have maps prepared showing the sewerage from time to time, and they should have been kept ready for inspection at the Town Hall, so that intending builders might get every information as to existing or intended drainings works?—I think that is only under the Act of 1878.

2748. Is there anything in your own special Act about that?—The powers are not availed of under our own special Act, and the Board do not like to exercise them.

2749. If under the Town Improvement Clauses Act of 1847?—They are incorporated with our Act.

2750. I was under the impression that parties were not allowed to build until they got the information I have spoken off?—There is a notice regarding building required to be given to the Commissioners.

2751. You know there has been a good deal of building in Rathmines since 1866, and you ought to know that the Public Health Act of 1866 required that every house within 100 feet of a main sewer should drain into that main sewer. Has that been done in Rathmines to your own knowledge?—There were several compulsory cases where they had to do the drainage. One of those items is an item you were referring to yesterday in the sanitary expenses. Where there was no sewer we made it to within 100 feet of the premises,

and we compelled the owner to make the rest of it.

2752. Can you say in reference to the main thoroughfares in Rathmines, that you have had sewers made from all the houses to the main sewer. Have you had a house-to-house inspection, to see if all these houses drain into the main sewer?—We have not.

2753. Is not that one of your duties, above all others, the carrying out of which is most important?—When we are about to make a main sewer we serve notice on the parties to take advantage of the main sewer when it is passing their premises, but we find it difficult to make them do so.

2754. Under the provisions of the Public Health Act of 1866, if they won't do it you are authorized to do it yourselves and to charge them with the cost of such work?—The Board never like to exercise those stringent conditions.

2755. How can you say that the Board attends to its duties, or that it has attended to its duties, when they have not carried out the law in the highly important matter—that is, not to allow people to drain into cesspools, but rather to provide public sewers and to make them drain into them?—I think they have exercised those powers as well as any other municipal board.

2756. Well, I can assure you, that would not say much for them, because I found in a number of places at which I sat that the Commissioners had not made any attempt to enforce their powers.

2757. **Mr. Heron.**—Are there 160 houses in Rathmines not drained at all?—I should say not.

2758. **Chairman.**—What do they drain into?—They drain, themselves, without notice. I say that, as a matter of convenience to themselves, and as a matter of safety to the houses, they do it themselves without notice.

2759. Can you undertake to say that you have had an inspection by the sanitary officer to whom you pay £50 a year, to know whether the Public Health Act has been carried out or not?—I cannot say that there has been an examination of every house drain.

2760. The reason I want to know about your drains and the system carried out by your surveyor with regard to the building of new houses, is to see if you take any care that the sewers from the houses drain into the public sewer?—All builders, before they commence building, come to the office and get the levels of the sewers. They get all the information they require on the subject at the office of the Commissioners. When we have made main sewers through roads we have served notice on every house abutting them to make the connection. We have never compelled those that didn't do it to do it.

2761. But the Act of Parliament requires that if they don't do it within the time specified, on notice, that you are to do it, and charge them with the cost. Have you ever done that?—I do not think we have ever compelled anyone to do that.

2762. Can you give me an idea of how many houses there are in Rathmines not draining into the public sewer?—I cannot.

2763. **Mr. Heron.**—The maps of the sewer would show that?—Yes; but I would have to go over thirty years to get the particulars of them.

2804. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any map showing the actual state of the sewers in Bathmains?—There is.

2805. Is there a map showing the sewers connecting with the main sewer from the smaller streets and lanes?—Yes.

2806. Take the great thoroughfare of Bathmains, how are the houses drained there?—They are all drained into the Swan river by a main sewer in the centre of the road.

2807. Are you able to say in reference to the whole of that thoroughfare that every house is connected with the main sewer?—I could not possibly answer for every house.

2808. There's the very thing, because if not, they must be drained into cesspools!—Not cesspools, certainly.

2809. Where else?—Some of the houses there have rear drains which were in existence before the township was incorporated.

2810. Dr. Newbold.—Are there any books in the office which would give you the information?—What information?

2811. That the Chairman has been asking you—for as to whether any of the houses in a special road or street have proper house accommodation in the shape of connecting drains?—We do the drains ourselves. There is an application made to the office for a house

drain, and we do the work from the maltings of the house to the main sewer.

2812. CHAIRMAN.—I see in the account there is a sum for sewer openings for the year!—That was the Extra amount paid by us for the road work.

2813. Mr. COTTON.—In the case of a new road being taken up by the township authorities, is there any report as to the state of the road and the sewerage in it before you take it up?—There is. By the order of the Board no new road is taken up without a main sewer, and when application is made to take up a road by the owner, it is referred to the surveyor for report and also for the inspection of the Road Committee.

2814. Then there is a report!—Yes.

2815. CHAIRMAN.—Do the persons who build new houses on these roads connect them with the main sewer—and does your surveyor see that they are drained into it and the connection properly made?—I cannot answer that. But when we make sewers the regular junction opening is put down opposite every house.

2816. Do you then see that the junction is afterwards properly made?—As I have already stated we never force anyone to make a junction drain except where the owner of the house has complained of defective sewerage.

Mr. RICHARD HARRARD, C.E., examined.

Mr. Richard Harrard, C.E.

2817. Mr. Walker.—Mr. Harrard, I need scarcely ask you are you an engineer of some considerable experience in drainage matters and water supply?—Yes.

2818. Are you well acquainted with Bathmains and Penbroke townships?—Very well.

2819. Are you at present engaged in carrying out an outfall sewer there for the local drainage to get rid of the sewage?—Yes, a work of outfall and of local drainage.

2820. Is that the work that is being prosecuted under the Act of 1877?—Yes.

2821. What will be the cost of that, about?—Altogether about £160,000.

2822. Have you any map there to show the course of that system of main drainage?—I can point it out.

2823. Mr. COTTON.—If you could describe it would be better?—The outfall sewer commences in the Clydron at Ball's-bridge, and is carried across the river Dodder, by way of Sandymount, into the Pigeon-house road. It traverses the Pigeon-house road, passing through the Pigeon-house Fort to a point at the White Bank, about half way between the Pigeon-house and Poolbeg, and there the sewage will be discharged into the river, or rather into the estuary, on the ebb tide between about an hour after high water and one hour before low water.

2824. How is Bathmains drained by it?—The whole of the Bathmains Township and a considerable part of the Penbroke Township drain into it by gravitation. There are, however, about 800 or 900 acres of the Penbroke Township which lie too low to be drained by gravitation, and the sewers I describe as local drainage are for that district. The two sewers converge at the point where the main outfall sewer crosses the Dodder, and there the sewage of the low-lying district will be lifted by steam power fifteen feet into the high-level sewer, by which it will be discharged, as I have already described.

2825. When that system is carried out will there be a thorough drainage system both for Bathmains and Penbroke?—As far as the outfall drainage goes it will be perfect.

2826. Do you remember the time that the Dublin Main Drainage Bill of 1871 was presented?—Yes.

2827. Were you employed by the townships in reference to that Act?—Yes, the Corporation sought power to include the townships within the scope of that Act with the power of unlimited rating, and the townships called me in and consulted me on the whole question

and instructed me to see if an independent system of main drainage for the two townships could not be devised, and I laid out a scheme then which was very similar to the one now under construction, and the result of that was that the Corporation agreed, upon the townships withdrawing their opposition, to limit the rate to £5 in the Bathmains township, and I think £4½ in the Penbroke township.

2828. If that Act of 1871 had been carried out where would the outfall have been?—The outfall would then have been further down the estuary, at the mouth of the harbour—at Poolbeg. In the scheme I then laid out for the townships I contemplated delivering the sewage at Poolbeg, but subsequent investigation showed that there would be no advantage gained by doing so; but that on the contrary it would positively be more advantageous to deliver where we are delivering now, at the White Bank, than Poolbeg, because we can deliver at the former place at a much higher level and at a much earlier period of the ebb tide.

2829. I believe another engineer may have adopted the same view?—Sir John Hawkshaw was consulted in the matter at my suggestion and gave the same very careful consideration, and he quite agreed that there would be no advantage gained by extending it to the mouth of the estuary. We can discharge there, at the White Bank, at a level of about four feet higher than we could if we extended it to Poolbeg and can discharge it about two hours earlier upon the ebb tide.

2830. Well, in the House of Lords, that 1871 Act was compromised between the townships and the Corporation?—Yes. I may say that there was some apprehension evinced here by some of the gentlemen whose arguments showed that there would be a deposit from the sewer on the shore. Well, when I tell you that in the period of the maximum sewage discharge, one cubic foot of sewage would be let into 15,000 cubic feet of water, I don't think there need be any grounds for such an apprehension.

2831. Mr. Walker.—And yourself and other eminent men have satisfied yourselves that this scheme of works now projected will suit the purpose for which it is intended?—Sir John Hawkshaw was quite satisfied about it.

2832. And the scheme will suit both for Bathmains and Penbroke?—Yes.

2833. You know as a matter of fact that the Act of 1871 was not carried out?—Yes.

2834. When were you re-employed, if I may use the term, by the townships, with a view to this Act of

DODDIE,
May 29, 1878.

Mr. Richard
Haward, C.E.

1837 1.—About six months before the application to Parliament.

1838. And then finding that nothing would be done by the Corporation, this present scheme of drainage was proposed—Yes; the Corporation scheme having fallen through.

1839. Were you present when the Act was being got—were you examined upon that Act of 1877?—Yes.

1840. And you are aware that a contract has been entered into and that the works are now in progress?—Yes; the contract has been taken within my estimate and the works are in progress. The total length of the sewer is six miles, and two and three-quarter miles of the main sewer have been executed.

1841. Will the system of drainage now in progress prevent the pollution of the Dodder?—It will prevent the pollution of the Dodder at Bell's Bridge, but the river Dodder is a good deal polluted above that point, and the Rathmines Commissioners have recently employed me to examine the locality and to lay out an intercepting sewer to prevent the sewage which now flows into the upper part from continuing to pollute the river, and I have furnished plans and a report upon the subject, and advised the two townships to unite, as part of the sewer would necessarily pass through Pembroke, and to make a sewer which would free the river from pollution.

1842. Will an intercepting sewer on one side of the river answer the purpose of the district on both sides?—Yes, and it is on the side best adapted, so that the sewerage from either side can be carried off.

1843. Do the Rathmines and Pembroke townships form a natural drainage area?—Very nearly so. There is the sewage of a small portion of the Rathmines township, at Greenmount and Harold's Cross, that now flows along with the water of a small stream into the city sewer. But in addition to the sewer that I have already spoken of for the relief of the Dodder, the Rathmines Commissioners have employed me to lay out another line of sewer to take the sewage from that locality into the Swan stream, and then it will be carried out through the new main sewer that I have spoken of.

1844. CHAIRMAN.—Was the Corporation scheme to discharge the sewage of the south side at Poolbeg—somewhere about the locality that you have selected?—The Corporation outfall was lower down. By the Corporation scheme the sewage of Rathmines and Pembroke would have been carried across to the north side under the river and along by Clontarf and discharged at the north Bull.

1845. Was that to have been done for Rathmines and Pembroke at 4d. in the pound?—At 4d. and 4½d., but the Corporation scheme only took in a part of the Pembroke township—the portion of the township on the west side of the river Dodder.

1846. Mr. Waller.—And that left a portion of the Pembroke township altogether undrained?—The Sandymount district was left undrained.

1847. And that is all included now?—Yes.

1848. What condition is the drainage of Dublin in?—Well, it is not in a very satisfactory state, I think.

1849. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Haward, if the drainage of Dublin was carried out as it was proposed at that time, to the north Bull, would there be any difficulty now in including all the drainage of Pembroke and Rathmines and taking it under the river, I mean as originally proposed?—It would be a very serious matter to do that now. It was proposed at that time to be taken under the river at Charles Bridge, which was a very small affair, now it would have to be taken under the estuary. Besides that, there would be no advantage in it, because we maintain that the point of outfall which we have adopted is more advantageous than if it was extended to Poolbeg.

1850. Mr. Waller.—You heard the statements made as to the price charged to the townships for water?—Yes; I heard Mr. Beveridge state, that because the Pembroke township got water at the rate of 8d.¹ per

the pound, and because their works of distribution within their township cost them, it was stated, another 3½d., they got the water for 7d. and therefore got it at half the price charged to the citizens of Dublin, who were paying 1s. 3d., but quite the reverse is the case. The townships are paying from two to three times as much for water as is charged to the citizens of Dublin.

1851. How do you arrive at these figures?—In order to show that, we must get first at what is the cost of the water to the citizens of Dublin. I have taken the published returns of the Corporation for the years 1877 and 1878—I have taken their receipts and their expenditure for those years. In their receipts, I have left out two or three matters which I think we could not put in, such as they take credit for, such as a certain sum of money paid by them for the Fire Brigade. Now as there is no Fire Brigade in the townships, I have omitted that item, and I have also omitted some small things—I don't know what they are—such as "Surcharged by Auditor £2 2s. 8d." Such small things as that I have omitted. The following is the statement of the receipts and expenditure in connexion with the Dublin Corporation Waterworks for the years 1877 and 1878, to which I am referring.—The total receipts in 1877 were £35,462 14s. 4d., and the expenditure was £31,509 1s. 1d., which included nearly £1,000 for making good a burst in the line of main pipes. In 1878 the receipts were £23,631 9s. 9d., and the expenditure was £22,585 19s. 8d. I have set out the items in the accounts which I hand in (see Appendix 19), so that you will see on the year 1877 the receipts were about £3,300 more than the expenditure. Then in the following year, with the same items given for expenditure, we have a total of £22,885 19s. 3d., while the receipts are £22,691 9s. 9d. So that the receipts, and the rents for works executed for various purposes, and the water sold, what may be taken as equal to the sewerage expenses and that leaves only the interest on the debt as the cost of the water to the citizens of Dublin. Now the total cost of the works was £610,000, and to pay off that, principal and interest, I have taken an average annual interest of five per cent., that amounts to an average annual payment of £30,500. Now the quantity of water passed out of the Roundwood Reservoir daily is about 15,000,000 gallons. Now of that about 2,000,000 are what is consumed in the townships, and probably about 1,000,000 gallons are sold for trade purposes. That leaves about 11,000,000 gallons daily for the consumption of the city, and that makes the cost to the citizens including every charge as 1-6d. per thousand gallons.

1852. Mr. Heron.—Are you counting 8,000,000 gallons of waste?—I am counting what is delivered into the city. Now we will take the case of the Pembroke township. The population is about 23,300 I believe, and the quantity of water used daily at 20 gallons per individual, which is the stipulated amount allowed, amounts to 470,000 gallons or 171,550,000 gallons per annum. That is paid for by a rate of 8d. in the pound, on ratesable property of £52,000. But to get at the cost to the consumer, and to compare it with the cost of Dublin, we must add the interest on the cost of the works of distribution, and the cost of supervision and management, as has been done in the case of the city, and that will make the total cost something like this.—The amount paid to the Corporation for water at 8d. in the pound, on £52,000, which I am told was about the cost of the works of distribution, at five per cent. is £960; and then for maintenance, salaries, supervision of the rates, and incidentals, I have been obliged to assume a sum, but I have assumed the very moderate sum of £600, and that gives a total of £28,495 19s. 8d., and that equals 8-49d. or 8½d. per 1,000 gallons, or nearly double the cost charged to the citizens of Dublin. Now, I will work out the same thing in the case of the Blackrock township.

1853. Mr. Waller.—You need not go into the case of

, the Blackrock township!—Well that amounts to 5/-3d. per 1,000 gallons in that case, or three times the cost charged to the citizens of Dublin. The £20,000 expended in the case of Rathmines included the cost of works outside the township in bringing the water from the canal, but in the case I have been citing I have only taken the works of distribution.

2851. CHAIRMAN.—But take it in another way—for the question is one that comes home to everyone. The citizens pay 1s. as the domestic water rate; that is what it costs the householder. Isn't the consumer to pay for that for his water in Dublin?—Is. 3d. was the amount that was stated.

2852. Yes, but 3d. is the public water rate. The consumer pays 1s. in Dublin?—Yes.

2853. Mr. Walker.—For what reason the township only 3½d.—There is nothing more fallacious than any comparative estimate of the cost based upon the value of realizable property, the value of realizable property varies so much in different localities. But let us take an extreme case to illustrate that point. The township of Tunbridge Wells, one of the most wealthy towns in England, where the valuation stands in a very high proportion, being about 25 per individual of the population, a 6d. rate there would amount to an average individual charge of 4s.; whereas, if you took any ordinary provincial town where the valuation is about £1 per individual, a rate of 1s. would amount to an individual annual charge of 2s.; and in the first case, a man paying for water by a rate of 6d. would pay double the sum paid in the second case, although the rate there was 1s.

2854. CHAIRMAN.—Everyman pays 1s. in the pound on the valuation in Dublin!—But I say that everyone only pays half the price that the townships pay. I can estimate what would be a precisely parallel case. If the corporation manufactured gas and charged in the city at the rate of 1s. per 1,000 cubic feet, and charged in Penrhos 7s. 7½d., and Broadgate 11s. 7d., and Rathmines 8s. 2d., and then claimed credit for supplying the townships at a less rate than they charged the citizens of Dublin for gas; that would be precisely a parallel case.

2855. Mr. Walker.—There have been statements made here several times as to the rate of individual taxation in the townships!—Yes.

2856. As regards Penrhos and Rathmines have you made any estimate as to that?—Will you excuse me for a moment. As we were talking on the subject of the water supply, I will give you a case that comes nearer home. In the Penrhos township we will say the rate is 3½d. in the pound, and that, for water supplied in bulk nad omitting the cost of distribution, amounts to 1 4½d. per thousand gallons, that is nearly 1½d. and that is upon a rate of 3½d. Take the case of Kilmainham township, and you know they pay a 4d. rate for their water. The price they pay for water is 9½d. or just about 3d. per thousand gallons, although rated at 4d. So that in the Penrhos township where they are rated at 3½d. they pay 3d., and in Kilmainham where they are rated at 4d. they pay 3d. That shows the absurdity of any estimate based upon the valuation of property.

2857. Well now you will remember I was asking you about the rate of individual taxation in the townships!—I am more at home at engineering matters than at those of taxation.

2858. CHAIRMAN.—I would like to understand the principle you are calculating if I can. Suppose a man has a house in the city of Dublin and another house in Rathmines and they are both valued at the same amount: he lives in one in the winter and in the other in the summer. For the house in town if the valuation is £100 a year he has to pay one hundred shillings, that is 5s. for his water. Now what does he pay for a house so valued in Rathmines?—I have not estimated it in that way. I have estimated it as regards the quantity supplied in each place and that is the only true method of comparison. The valuation of the Penrhos township is about £4 per individual of the

population, while in the city it is about £2 6s. 8d., and with equal rates in both places the gentleman living in Rathmines would pay, if the valuation was the same proportion as Penrhos, pretty nearly £1.00, or double what is charged in the city.

2859. I was only putting the case on the assumption that if I had to pay 1s. in Dublin and 3d. in Rathmines, I would pay in one case 4s. and in the other £2 10s. 1d.—No, sir. If the valuation of Rathmines is nearly double, as it is, a 6d. rate in Rathmines would be equal to a shilling rate in Dublin for the same article.

2860. Mr. Walker.—You were going to tell us something about the individual taxation in the townships as compared with the city!—Of course where the valuation is high with equal rates it will give a higher individual taxation. Individually the inhabitants of the townships are paying more per annum than is paid in the city, and then to put a 4s. 6d. rate on them all round would be of course a very heavy rate of taxation. A 4s. 6d. rate would be an individual charge of 18s. in Rathmines.

2861. Are you acquainted with the state of the roads generally throughout the Rathmines and Penrhos townships as compared with the state of the Dublin streets?—I have had occasion to go through the Penrhos and Rathmines townships a good deal and the roads and streets there appear to me to be very fairly kept indeed.

2862. What would you say by way of contrast?—Well the main streets of Dublin are no doubt fairly and well kept, but I do not think the same statement could apply to the bye streets. Last autumn I had occasion to go through one of them, it was Townsend-street, and there had been at the time some period of dry weather, there had been no rain to wash out the gutters of the street and the whole surface was covered with pools of stagnant filth and accumulation of every kind. That was just one particular instance that came under my notice. There were the entrails of fish and all sorts of things thrown out on the surface of the street and they had been there evidently for several days.

2863. Have you considered this question about which we have heard so much of late, namely, the use of the city roads by the township, and so on?—Yes, I have.

2864. What is your opinion about that?—I think the use of the streets and roads within the city is, to a great extent counterbalanced by the traffic that is brought from the townships, from the outside districts, into the city; such as building materials, stone for the repair of the roads, of which Mr. Neville spoke, and hay and straw and agricultural produce of every kind, and then the cattle, they are grazed in the districts outside the townships and they are driven through the townships into the city. The manure on the other hand is carried out of the city through the townships to the districts beyond. And in addition to that, nearly all the main roads leading from the city into the townships—such as Chancery-street, Charlemont-street, Richmond-road, Camden-street, Harcourt-road, Harcourt-street, Stephen's-green West and North, Merrion-square West and North sides, Lower Mount-street, Fitzwilliam-street, Baggot-street, these are all kept up by the Tramway Company, and wagons with bricks and coal and other heavy material carried through those streets, and also the carts by preference use the paved portion of the roadway, and that is kept up and repaired by the Tramway Company and not by the Corporation.

2865. Would it be desirable to give the streets in the suburbs?—Oh, I think not. I heard a gentleman—Alderman Harris I think—talking fault with the practice of not having paved. I live in one of the best of the suburbs near London—Upper Norwood, and it is only in the hilly portions it is done there, but where the streets are level, such as in Wellington-road, it is quite unnecessary. I know it is not done where I live, and it is not necessary, and even if it was necessary, it is not a matter of any expense.

2866. Mr. Heron.—Do I understand it to be your

DISTRICT.
May 20, 1879.
Mr. Richard
Howard, Q.C.

opinion that the taxation of the townships—Pembroke and Bathmains—is at present nearly as high as the taxation of Dublin?—Higher.

2857. Higher?—Yes.

2858. I mean the rate of taxation?—Yes, individual taxation.

2859. And how much higher is it in Pembroke than it is in the city of Dublin?—In Dublin a 4s. 6d. rate would give you about 10s. 6d. of an individual payment. In Pembroke a rate of 3s. 3d. would give you an individual payment of 11s. 6d., and in Bathmains the same rate would give you an individual payment of 12s. 6d.

2860. So that at present actually there is no real relief of taxation by dwelling in the townships?—The individual annual payment is higher in the townships.

2871. And of course, as you know, all the payment of taxes falls in the rent of the houses alone?—It is paid for by the occupier.

2872. Oh, yes, but the occupier pays it in the shape of rent at present?—I can only give you the actual result—that the payment is made. I don't know who pays it.

2873. Don't you consider as a matter of fact that the ultimate taxation falls on the landlord?—I cannot tell you how the payments are divided.

2874. As regards the Vauxtry waterworks, they have been to a certain extent a success?—Yes, a great success.

2875. And not only as regards the supply, but financially they are a success?—They are; they are a cheap waterworks. About £2 per head of the population is the cost of supply, and that is cheap water.

2876. And the supply of water is almost unlimited?—Yes, but I mean as regards the population. The supply is limited by the quantity that passes through the aqueduct between Rownwood and the Distillation Tank—that is about 14,000,000 gallons.

2877. Do you consider it right that the inhabitants of the township should pay for their water at the same rate as the inhabitants of the city of Dublin?—I can only say, as I have already told you, that they pay higher for it than the inhabitants of the city of Dublin.

2878. I know they do, but do you consider that they should pay at the same rate?—I don't think the rate charged for water is very exorbitant. I don't think that—but it is very much higher than what the citizens of Dublin pay.

2879. Supposing then that Pembroke, Bathmains, and Dublin were joined and the same rate struck for the three for water—would not that be a better plan?—But what you say is that the same rate is not struck for the water there as is embodied in the rate for the city. A 4s. 6d. township rate would cause the individual payment there to a very high price.

2880. If you separated the water and only charged the township the same rate as the Corporation charge the city, that would relieve the township?—Yes in that respect.

2881. That is what I want to know?—Yes it would be that respect; you charge them more than the city and of course such an arrangement would lessen the cost to them.

2882. If amalgamated and charged the same rate for water they would be relieved?—Yes, if you amalgamated them only in respect of water.

2883. To what extent would they be relieved?—Well, Pembroke pays double and Blackrock about three times the price charged to the city.

2884. Three times the amount it ought to pay?—I don't say three times the amount it ought to pay; but three times what the water costs the citizens of Dublin.

2885. But I say three times what they should pay with proper taxation equalized?—Yes, for water only.

2886. The new main sewer that is running down between Ball's-bridge and London-bridge—there was a very offensive, bad sewer discharging into the Dodder there?—And is still. That is the Swan river that

takes the whole of the sewage of Bathmains and the sewage of a portion of Pembroke.

2887. And is the Swan river to be run down there?—Yes, that existing sewer is left there merely as an outlet for storm water.

2888. In the construction of that new sewer, do the different old sewers join it?—No; but junctions have been made that will unite them as soon as the new sewer is put into operation. Of course we could not run the sewage in until the main sewer was completed; but wherever we have constructed new sewers we have put in junctions with the existing sewers and also junctions for the probable house drains, and all these junctions are carefully registered on the map.

2889. In managing the outfall of this sewer you will have it running for about four hours?—Yes, about four hours.

2890. And running of course only with the ebb tide?—Yes, we can discharge everything in something about one hour and twenty minutes. We can discharge all the impounded sewage in that time.

2891. Have you Pitstock chambers for the purpose of impounding the sewage?—Yes, at the outfall, and catch tanks, and flushing apparatus as well, and ventilators and manholes for the purposes of the examination of the sewer. In fact we have everything that is usual in works of the kind.

2892. Is this to drain the surface water?—It will carry off a part of it. It will drain the entire water running off the surface to about one-fifth of an inch, in 24 hours, the surface water being carried off and delivered at the outfall in combination with the sewage. The remaining surface water will be discharged—I mean the overflow, will be discharged into the river. The first overflow, is below London-bridge. That would be mixed with sewage. It is impossible to provide for the drainage of rainfall beyond a certain proportion. The No. 2 overflow is about half way between the Coastguard Station and Pigeon-house Fort, and No. 3 overflow is at the White Bank.

2893. Mr. CORROX.—With reference to the drainage scheme for Pembroke and Bathmains, would it benefit any outside district beyond those townships?—In which direction?

2894. Say Milltown?—Yes, the whole of it.

2895. You have provided for that?—Yes, the main outfall is made of sufficient capacity for that.

2896. Does it comprehend Terenure?—Yes, Bathmains and the whole of that locality.

2897. And the Bathmains side of the river?—Yes, provision will be made for that sewage. If the Commissioners bring in any more outside, they would make a junction that would serve Terenure and Rathfarnham and the district below that, between that and the Pembroke township, on the east side of the river.

2898. And would it apply to the Blackrock district?—No. Portions of the Blackrock township, as far back as Temple-hill, can be brought direct into the low-level sewer of the Pembroke township—in fact, there is some negotiation going on about it. Some application has been made by the Blackrock Commissioners to know if the Drainage Board wish to take them in.

2899. You don't contemplate taking in any portion of the south part of the city of Dublin?—No.

2900. You said, I think, that it was not desirable to pass any of the streets or roads of the township?—I think they are better left unopened.

2901. Don't you think it would be desirable to complete the paving of such as are more than half paved by the Tramway Company?—Yes.

2902. CHAIRMAN.—You talked about the cattle coming through the townships to the market in the city. Nearly nearly all the cattle sold in the cattle market come by the railways?—Some of them do.

2903. What cattle are driven in through the townships?—Any of the cattle grazed in districts outside the township are driven in through the township and do not come by the railways.

2904. As regards the cattle grazed in districts outside

DUBLIN.
May 29, 1878.
Mr. Robert
Hassard, c.m.

the townships, the people drive out in their vans and walk there and the produce is brought in!—Yes, no doubt, but I am talking about cattle brought in to the cattle market to be sold.

2903. I apprehend that you will find very few are driven in!—I don't know as to that.

2904. Is it your experience that the streets of Dublin are not very much more made use of by the people living in the townships, than the streets of the townships are made use of by the people living in the city?—No doubt the people of the townships walk through them in the same way that the people of Dublin use the footways of Kingstown.

2905. Now take the article of coal, have you made any calculation as to what is the amount of coal carried from the quays of Dublin to the townships of Rathmines and Pengee. Is it not about 100,000 tons a year?—I could not say.

2906. Some one gave it to me that allowing five tons to each house it would amount to 70,000 tons!—I have not made any calculation on the subject.

2907. If you take the distilleries and large establishments into account and consider the large quantities of coal used at those places and that is brought through the city, must not that largely use the streets of Dublin?—It uses the portion of the streets kept in repair by the tramway company—all the main roads leading out to the townships; the centre of those roads is kept in repair by the tramway companies, and as a matter of fact may cart or conveyance heavily loaded takes the centre of the road as a matter of convenience.

2908. Have you made any calculation as to what it would take to keep up the roads of a township such as Rathmines or Pengee?—It would very very much according to the locality.

2909. Mr. M. C. Bentley.—Would I be out of order in putting a question to the witness?—Or, Mr. Chairman, perhaps I might put the question through you. In September, 1878, you, Mr. Hassard, made a report to the Town Commissioners of Rathmines on the water question, so far as a supply to Rathmines was concerned, and reported on a variety of schemes, and you

wound up your report by advising the Town Commissioners to deal with the Dublin Corporation for the Varty at 10d. on the valuation of the township!

Witness.—Oh, no sir, I beg your pardon.

2910. CHAIRMAN.—Have you got that report?

Witness.—I have not.

2911. Perhaps Mr. Evans will give it to us!—

2912. Mr. Hassard.—What advised them to do was this, and I am as well satisfied. That if the Corporation would agree to give them an independent supply, to deliver a certain quantity, 1,000,000 gallons daily for their own purposes, and put into a tank for them, if they would do that, I would advise them to pay the Corporation 2d. per thousand gallons.

2913. Mr. Bentley.—On a calculation that would amount to 10d. in the pound on the valuation.

Witness.—There is my report. (Report handed to witness by Mr. Evans.) Is it I state—

"If arrangements can be made with the municipal authorities for an independent guaranteed supply of 1,000,000 gallons, to be increased hereafter, if required, to 1,000,000 gallons daily, at 2d. per 1,000 gallons; and that the corporation will purchase the township works between Collywarrne and Harold's Cross Bridge at £11,000, I should advise the Commissioners agreeing to such an arrangement in preference to laying out in their money is extending the present works, as I believe that the increased pressure which would be so obtained and the superior quality for general purposes of the Varty water, would quite warrant the additional cost."

2914. Mr. Heron.—Is it your opinion that the Varty water is better than the supply they have in Rathmines?—*Ceteris paribus*, I should prefer it.

2915. Is it your opinion that the pressure is not sufficient for such a township as Rathmines?—I think it would be better to have a higher pressure.

2916. You said that if the Corporation guaranteed 1,000,000 a day you would advise them to agree to terms with the Corporation?—I advised that in consideration of the matter of outlay necessitated by that arrangement.

Mr. SAMUEL H. BOLTON examined.

2917. Mr. Andrews.—You are one of the Town Commissioners of Rathmines?—Yes.

2918. And you have been so I believe for about nine years?—Yes.

2919. You are an extensive builder and have had experience in building both in Dublin and in the townships of Rathmines and Pengee?—Yes.

2920. May I take the liberty of inquiring how much you have invested in expenditure on building, &c., in the townships of Rathmines and Pengee?—Between £30,000 and £30,000.

2921. May I also ask you what income is derivable out of that?—about £1,000—I may say that part of the expenditure I have named was for my business concerns, I suppose about £1,000 a year.

2922. And you also have large property in Dublin?—I have some property in Dublin.

2923. And a very substantial income out of that, have you not?—I have a comfortable income out of that.

2924. And you are able therefore to look dispassionately at the position of matters both in Dublin and in the townships?—Yes.

2925. Have you considered the question of the annexation of the townships to Dublin?—I have.

2926. Especially Pengee and Rathmines?—I have.

2927. Are you in favour of the project?—Indeed I am not. I consider it a monstrous scheme of "beggar thy neighbour," in plain words.

2928. Have you formed any opinion as to what the additional taxation from Rathmines alone would be per annum?—Between £10,000 and £12,000 per annum.

2929. And in your judgment would that bring you a course of better management?—Directly the reverse.

2930. From your experience, both as a Commissioner and as an owner of property in Rathmines, is the management there satisfactory?—It is.

2931. With regard to your meetings and hours of meeting—you meet at nine o'clock in the morning and do you continue sitting until you finish your business?—We do.

2932. Have you any hard and fast limit that you must go away at ten o'clock?—Certainly not.

2933. Have you been there later?—Yes, frequently until after eleven o'clock—as the business required it.

2934. Now while I am upon that, as a builder, if you required to know where you were building—where the main drainage of Rathmines is, have you facilities for ascertaining that?—Yes, the surveyor is ready to give all information.

2935. And, taking yourself and any other builder who wished to lay out his drainage to the best advantage, have you the opportunity of knowing where the house drains should be, and the mains to which they should be connected?—He gives all instructions and he has a map at the Town Hall which will give a great amount of information.

2936. Is there an examination in Dublin—a house-to-house inspection or anything like it, to show where the house connections with the main drainage take place?—I am about twenty-five years as employer and I never knew the Corporation to make any such examination.

2937. Is your drainage for the large district of Rath-

Mr. Samuel
H. Bolton.

DUBLIN,
May 20, 1878.
Mr. Samuel H.
Bullock.

mines as satisfactory as could be desired, having regard to the locality and its circumstances!—Since we got the new Public Health Act we improved it.

2940. And when you have this new scheme perfected that Mr. Hassard is engaged upon will you have a very perfect system of drainage!—I expect so.

2941. Your establishment, I gathered from what you told me, at present is in Rathmines!—Yes.

2942. And I believe you spent a great deal of money on it!—Yes.

2943. I suppose you employ a good many men!—Yes, I do.

2944. Those men live in Dublin!—The majority of them do.

2945. Do you consider it a disadvantage to Dublin that your labourers should use Dublin as their place of residence!—Well the majority of the men employed by me are skilled artisans with liberal wages, who live in the city and spend their money there, and I consider that that is one of the means of making the city wealthy—the money spent in it.

2946. Are the affairs of the township, which you have a good opportunity of examining and understanding, well conducted!—They are, fairly, and every attention paid to any complaint, or to any desire for improvement.

2947. From your experience with reference to the municipal management of Dublin, do you think it would be an improvement to become united to the city!—I do not: I consider it would be quite the reverse.

2948. Have you considered the question of the wear and tear of the Dublin streets by the inhabitants of the township!—I have.

2949. What is the result of your experience, and your opinion on the subject!—Well, as to the wear and tear of the streets of Rathmines, I think but little consideration will show that no matter what the wear and tear is to the city from the traffic from the city to the township, in reference to the supply to the latter, the wear and tear on the township is much greater as regards the supply to the city. For instance, Mr. Nevile spoke of 6,000 tons of road metal as passing over the township to the city. I believe that should be nearer 20,000 tons, including the gravel and sand that is brought through the township for the use of Dublin; and in the case of all buildings for which the Ballyknocken granite is used, it is all brought through the township. In reference to one quarry alone, I made inquiries as to the quantity of material sent out to Dublin—that sent from Bond's quarry—and I was informed that from 10,000 to 12,000 tons were sent from it for the construction of buildings in Dublin. Then there is the rubble granite brought from localities beyond Rathmines.

2950. Does the township derive any benefit whatever from the transmission of those materials!—None whatever; but, on the other hand, merchandise, cattle, &c., are brought from the city, and they are a source of profit to the Dublin traders, who are the gentlemen who are interested in the taxation; and in that way the Rathmines people, by paying the profit on those things, contribute to the support of the city, and, in that way, help to pay the taxes there to a certain extent.

2951. You are acquainted with the way in which the roads and thoroughfares of Rathmines are paved, and also with the way in which they are paved in Dublin. How do you think they contrast!—Why Rathmines contrasts most favourably; in fact, there is no comparison.

2952. To come a little out of generalities—outside the main streets, such as Sackville-street, Westmoreland-street, and streets of that class—are the Dublin streets in good or bad order!—In very bad order. As a matter of fact, there are very few people either in the township or the city have a better means of judging of the state of the streets. My business is continually out of doors. I am continually driving in the city and townships, and, in that way, I am

qualified to speak on the subject. The state of the principal streets gives no idea of the filth of the interior streets—in such localities as the Combe, Chamber-street, Townend-street; and in all these streets there is nothing but refuse of all sorts lying, perhaps, a couple of inches deep. That is no exaggeration at all. Anyone walking or driving through any of the localities I have named, will at once see what state the streets are in.

2953. It was mentioned in the course of this inquiry that it would be an advantage in some way desirable from sanitation, that there would be a better way of taking away the scavenging matter from Dublin. Is there any way of removing it, as far as you are aware!—Some years ago it was suggested to get barges and traps; and I suppose these would be got for between £2,000 and £3,000, which would relieve the city of all this mud, and make the city less unhealthy.

2954. Mr. Corcoran—£2,000 or £3,000 would not provide all these appliances!—Well, I suppose one steamer would be enough, and that would cost about £1,000, and then you would have four or five barges, which would be lying alongside the different docks to receive the mud, and to have it brought out and thrown into the sea; and then the empty ones could be filled while the others were conveying out and discharging their cargoes.

2955. What would you put the price of the barges at!—About £150 a piece.

2956. CHAIRMAN.—For £3,000! Surely you would never get them for that money!—Yes, you would; unless, like the Corporation, you went in for something mighty grand, and then the result would be, as usual, nothing. I have had experience of the master of which I am now speaking. I have bought a steamer myself. You will see Messrs. Grinnan's steamers towing down cargoes of these barrels of porter down the river, and—

2957. One of those would not be fit to go out to Houth, and they would not be allowed to discharge the stuff within a limited distance!—You may depend I am not outside the margin at all. What are these boats that the Ballast Board use for taking in ballast!

2958. Are they not large, flat, tug steamers!—I am speaking of the boats for carrying ballast. It is such as those I would have on the Liffey, to put to that use, in connection with the removal of scavenging refuse, to tow them out.

2959. How far would you tow!—As far as necessary.

2960. You would have to get it towed out some seven or eight miles!—At present Mr. Stony is filling up the inside of the quay wall, and he would be very glad if I am not outside the margin at all. What are we speaking of, cheap, too.

2961. Mr. Andrews.—And there is a very large tract about to be taken in by the Port and Docks Board!—Yes, and I suppose Mr. Stony would take the refuse for years to put inside that quay wall.

2962. Would they allow anyone to build on that ground without laying down a concrete flooring in order to prevent efflorescence!—The ground where this stuff would be deposited would not be used for residence at all.

2963. Would you propose to leave it an open place. At this moment in the Metropolitan district in London, where they are opening up new neighbourhoods to the west, they have found such a provision necessary, from the houses being built on sites where scavenging was deposited!—Yes, but you appear to forget that all the North-wall grounds have been made up with mud swept up from the city, and that is now the most valuable part of the city for stores.

2964. It may be so for stores, and for collecting the beasts there before they are shipped, but would you like to build houses there!—I have not suggested that either.

2965. Mr. Andrews.—Is there any difficulty or objection, in your judgment, sanitary or otherwise, to putting the street sweepings upon sites such as the land takes

in at the North-wall by the Port and Docks Board!—Not that I am aware of.

2968. In point of fact a great deal of the North Lotts was raised in that way!—It was all raised in that way.

2967. And we have there a handsome new railway station, a large quantity of valuable stores, and great municipal improvements!—Yes.

2968. Was there ever any plan under consideration in Dublin for sweeping the streets at night!—That was talked of but nothing ever came of it.

2969. Is that done in England!—Yes, and I consider that if it were carried out in this city it would be a boon to the public, and the work could be done cheaper too.

2970. As you have much experience of building, is the management in relation to the asphalting of the footways such as you approve of in Dublin!—In my opinion the working out of the details of the Corporation, looking at the matter as a taxpayer and a citizen, is altogether faulty. I may say in reference to a particular instance bearing out that statement, that I noticed in reference to the footway in South Richmond-street, that when it was asphalted the work had been completed the kerbstone was taken up and when put down again it was raised too high for the asphalt, and the asphalt had to be made right afterwards, so there you had three "efforts" at doing the one job. I have a very poor opinion of the way in which the details of the Corporation works are carried out. Whether the engineer is thwarted by the members or vice versa I don't know, but looking at the thing as it stands it is a very unsatisfactory affair.

2971. With regard to the system of valuation, at present I believe if you add a house it is altogether valued over again as if new!—Yes.

2972. If you add a wing to your house it is not the whole of the house revalued!—I think so, but I cannot say positively.

2973. Do you think the working of the present system of valuation encourages or discourages improvements in Dublin!—It discourages improvements, and it is unjust to the township to a certain extent as regards the Poor Law contributions.

2974. And in order to have a just system of taxation ought there to be a revaluation of Dublin altogether!—There ought, without doubt.

2975. It has been said as a reason for the annexation of the townships that the building space in the city is almost used up. Do you concur in that assertion!—I do not; I think a great deal of it is fit for building yet, and if there was any energy or ability displayed by the Corporation in opening up new streets there is ample room for a long time.

2976. Is the system of administration in Dublin such as to encourage expenditure in building, or clearing ground for building purposes!—It is not.

2977. Would you do it yourself!—I would not, unless I saw great inducement.

2978. As regards the hospitals, lunatic asylums, and industrial schools and reformatories—do the townships already pay their share towards the maintenance of those institutions in the Grand Jury case!—We pay our share of the County expenses.

2979. Have you in your municipal meetings ever an abortive meeting, or are you obliged to postpone the holding of a meeting for the want of a sufficient attendance of members or anything of that kind!—It has never occurred in my memory, and I am about nine years a Councillor.

2980. And now, as an owner of property of considerable extent both in Dublin and in Rathmines, and having considered the matter carefully, are you able to say that you are decidedly opposed to any annexation!—I am.

2981. Can you form any idea for the Commissioners just now, coming on to that question of the roads, of what the charge from the new markets would be in itself!—I would expect it would be about 70,000

cartsloads or tons of emotions or rubbish removed from that.

2982. From the site of the new markets in South Great George's-street!—Yes. It has all to be excavated for carriage.

2983. Are they taken through the township to some place beyond!—Yes, they are; I understand to Donnybrook.

2984. CHAIRMAN.—If Mr. Stoney is so anxious to get staff, why does he not get that!—I don't know.

2985. You have suggested that Mr. Stoney would be glad to get the sweeping of the streets!—Yes; and he has plenty of space for filling up with them. I repeat that.

2986. I am sure the stuff from the markets would be perfectly unobjectionable for filling, but there are several considerations with regard to the scavenged stuff!—Some member of the Corporation—I think it was Mr. Byrnes, who is now Collector-General—suggested that tracks should be made, and advantage taken of the tramways for such a purpose; but, as in the case of all such projects, nothing was done, and that is what I complain of. No matter what useful suggestions are made, they are all left lie, and the city remains as it is.

Cross-examined by Dr. Norwood.

2987. You spoke about the faulty mode in which the asphalting in South Richmond-street was carried out!—I did.

2988. Were you aware that the contractor had failed to do his work efficiently, and that he was made to do it properly!—That might be the case, but I spoke of what I saw.

2989. You didn't know the history of that!—I did not.

2990. Do you think the Corporation acted properly in making the contractor do his work properly when he did it initially!—Yes, I do.

2991. Do you think that was an absolutely business-like way of doing the matter, as far as they were concerned!—I do.

2992. Do you know South Richmond-street!—Perfectly well.

2993. Did you observe the Limerick asphalt laid down on the opposite side!—Yes; it is opposite my house.

2994. Did you ever see better!—No.

2995. Then you have built within the city boundary!—I have.

2996. And, I gather from what you have said, considerably!—Yes, I have.

2997. You recommended that the streets should be swept by night!—I do recommend that certain streets should be swept by night.

2998. I take it that in those matters you have taken the utmost pains to do what is right and proper in Rathmines. Do you sweep the streets of Rathmines at night!—You know Paris is not better kept than your township—in that respect!—No, we do not, because the surface is smaller and the traffic not so great as in the city.

2999. But you have twenty-two miles of streets and considerable traffic—is not that the fact!—There are only one or two main roads, and the rest are by-roads.

3000. Are those done by night!—They are not.

3001. Have you heard any complaints from the inhabitants of Rathmines with regard to the scavenging not only of the main thoroughfares, but of those which are subsidiary or secondary streets!—I have.

3002. Were those complaints from ratepayers of Rathmines!—They were; but if the Commissioners were all angels there would be some complaints.

3003. Quite so. Then the Corporation of Dublin is not the only municipal body which is the subject of animadversions!—They are not, but they get their fair share.

3004. Are you the Mr. Belton that transferred his premises outside the city boundary!—The very man.

3005. Do you agree with Mr. Hassard that Rath-

BUSINESS
May 20, 1879.
—
Mr. Seaward
H. Belton.

DUBLIN,
May 26, 1878.
Mr. Second
H. St. John.

mine is more heavily taxed than Dublin!—I didn't hear Mr. Hazard say that.

3006. But he did say that!—He meant the individual rating.

3007. You were surprised to hear that!—Well, I was.

3008. Did that method of calculation ever strike the Commissioners or you before!—I never entertained the question at all in that way.

3009. Were you surprised to learn that you were more heavily taxed in your new premises than in those you left!—You are drawing a wrong conclusion.

3010. Did you bear the question put to him by the Commissioner, Mr. Exham, that he had a house valued at £100 within the city, and a house valued at £100 outside the city boundary, and that in the one case he paid £5 for water, and in the other case he paid 25/- for water?—He instituted a comparison that would be proper if you could bring Mr. Exham's house from Fitzwilliam-square and take it out there. Then you would see what the valuation would be.

3011. What is the valuation of your own house!—I don't remember the present valuation.

3012. What is the present valuation!—Well, of my business premises, I think it is £120.

3013. If your premises were at the other side of the Portobello Hotel, within the city, what would your water rate be!—I have not gone into those calculations.

3014. With a valuation of £120, do you think you could give an answer: with a valuation of £120, and a water rate of 1s. in the pound, what is the result!—That is £6.

3015. With a valuation of £120, and a water rate of 3d. in the pound, what would then be the result!—Half of that—I mean a fourth of it—that is 30s.—a quarter of £6.

3016. That dispels of Mr. Hazard's theory!—I don't think it does. I don't agree with you at all.

3017. Do you agree with Mr. Hazard that there is nothing in figures!—I often heard it said that accountants could turn figures any way.

3018. You have property in the township of Rathmines!—Yes.

3019. Do you consider the condition of the footways there satisfactory!—I have heard of no complaints.

3020. Are they kerbed!—Yes.

3021. All around!—They are generally not kerbed until houses are there.

3022. Are the lanes in that neighbourhood well and sufficiently scavenged!—In some instances they are.

3023. Have you ever heard any complaints!—I have.

3024. From ratepayers!—I have heard a complaint from Mr. Bentley as to a particular place on one occasion, and I visited the place, and I saw a couple of carts of the contents of skips, and I have seen the same thing in Dublin before the police could catch the parties who deposited that stuff, and if our officers had caught them they would be desired to deal with them in the same way as if the police caught them.

3025. How long do you know Dublin!—All my life.

3026. Have you noticed any improvements in the city of late years!—Yes, considerable improvement, but I would prefer the paving to be better done than it is.

3027. Do you speak of that with reference to recent years!—I speak of Francis-street. I pass through that street frequently, and in my opinion it was very badly done.

3028. That is your opinion!—Yes, and I may tell you my reason. Parties very rarely see a street in its nakedness; but I have gone through that street at six o'clock in the morning, and after a night's rain I have seen pools of water lying in it. That is not good paving. I repeat the statement that I have seen it, and I attribute the bad paving to the system carried on. Theoretically, the plan adopted may be a good one, but

practically, I think it is quite the reverse. They remove the surface, and put down a surface of a level bed of paving stones. In Townsend-street they are doing that at present, and I was looking at the work going on yesterday. In place of the foundation for the paving stones being prepared and made of proper solidity, the stones are being put down on the theory that the traffic will press them down level. Instead of that, when the men come to pave it, when they are making excavations for some other works, that portion of the street is softer, and when the weight comes on the paving the street goes down.

3029. Where have you seen the work done on a different principle!—I have seen stone rollers used in London.

3030. On the streets!—On streets being prepared for paving.

3031. Were you ever in Manchester!—I was not.

3032. Is the water supply of Rathmines satisfactory to the ratepayers!—Yes, to the majority of the ratepayers.

3033. How have you ascertained that!—By several means. In one way I may mention that at the last couple of elections for Commissioners the gentlemen anxious to get seats on the Board made that their "ticket," as the Americans say, and they were refused admission by the ratepayers to the Board, while those in favour of the canal water were far and away in the majority. That is one of the ways of testing it.

3034. But there are more or less complaints about the water supply of Rathmines!—There are people living in Dublin who would prefer the Rathmines water.

3035. Do you think the Rathmines water better than the Vartry, or vice versa!—Water drinkers prefer the Rathmines water.

3036. That is what comes from the canal!—Yes.

3037. Do you think the water satisfactory!—I would rather have it better.

3038. Then you think the township would be better supplied if it had the Vartry water!—I don't know that we would have better water than. As a Rathmines ratepayer and a Commissioner I would go in for an independent source of supply entirely. There is plenty of water coming from close to the source of the Dodder which would supply Rathmines and the adjoining district, and as a public undertaking it would be better not to have the Vartry, because, from the source I speak of, we would be not only able to supply Rathmines, but the localities adjoining, and we would get a better fall.

3039. Did you ever calculate what it would cost!

Mr. Hazard.—There is an admirable supply of water to be had from the Dodder. There is a tract of elevated mountain land drawing into the Dodder, and its tributaries consist of granite and limestone formation, which produces, when the streams are not swollen by flood, water free from colour, and soft and pure. A supply from that source could be got for £80,000.

3040. And there are persons in Rathmines and in the city itself who prefer the Vartry water to the canal!—Yes; and vice versa.

3041. CHAIRMAN.—Did you calculate what you would have to pay the mill-owners?

3042. Mr. Hazard.—That was all provided for by the compensation they were to be given in water.

3043. Mr. Corlett.—What pressure would the service reservoir give!—It could be at an altitude of either 300, 325, or 350 feet above the ordnance level. Taking into account the proximity of the city, that pressure would be very much more effective by 100 feet than the Vartry pressure. This service reservoir might be at an altitude of 325, 350, or 375 feet above the ordnance datum, as might be deemed desirable. It would be distant about two miles from the bridge over the river Dodder, between Rathgar and Rathfarnham, and from its altitude and proximity to the township, would secure an ample and effective pressure.

3044. Mr. Corcoran.—What would be the supply—2,000,000 gallons daily for domestic consumption. That is independent of compensation in water.

3045. You would have 2,000,000 gallons daily for the people?—Yes.

3046. When you speak of the compensation of the people by water, did you make any bargain with them?—The law of compensation is very well understood in England. A certain fixed quantity is impounded in a reservoir, and passed daily down the stream, instead of an irregular and intermittent flow as exists at present.

3047. The question of whether the reservoir should be 330 or 360 feet of an altitude is a matter of expenditure?—No; a matter of choice. The ground is very gently sloping.

3048. What induced you to choose the lower one?—Because when you get water beyond a certain pressure it becomes rather unmanageable and difficult to deal with; I mean for distribution in the town. The buildings are more expensive and more difficult to keep in order, and the waste generally greater. If the scheme ever came to anything, I should advise them to take a higher service.

Mr. R. H. Bourke's cross-examination resumed.

3049. Dr. Newseed.—Most of the artisans in your employment are, you said, skilled persons?—Yes.

3050. Who reside in Dublin?—The majority of them do.

3051. And then you stated the reason for that was economically that it was of advantage for them to spend their money in Dublin?—I didn't state that.

3052. What did you state?—That as a matter of fact they lived in the city and spent their money there.

3053. And that is of advantage to the city. Well now let us change the way of putting it. A great number of gentlemen who make their money in the city live in Bathmines. Is that advantageous to Bathmines?—But they spend their money in the city.

3054. But they don't reside there?—If they reside in Bathmines they get their food from the city.

3055. Do they contribute anything to the taxation?—Taking the commerce into account, I dare say it would be nearly as taxed as it is long.

3056. Did you ever hear of persons having small offices in the city, apartments, and so on?—These are visitors and things which will occur in any city. You might as well complain of a commercial man coming from London over here and having a showroom in which he displayed his goods in a hotel. These are things which are found to occur in every city.

3057. Then the fact of a large number of persons living in Bathmines and Parnell's townships, and transacting their business in the city, and spending their money there?—And there is nothing to prevent them from going to London or anywhere else they please, to do their business where they like, and I say that the Bathmines people give greater benefit to Dublin than the same class of people who live in Kingstown, because as they live a greater part of their life in the city than the people further off do. I think that is fair logic.

3058. Those artisans to whom you have referred, when they are sick, where do they go for hospital accommodation?—To the City or to the County Hospital, for which we pay a proportion, I think.

3059. In what way do you pay a proportion?—A portion of our Grand Jury sum goes to the maintenance of the County Hospital.

3060. How much?—I could not tell you.

3061. Do you pay £100?—I could not tell you.

3062. Or £200? I could not tell you.

3063. Mr. Andrews.—It goes in the Grand Jury sum. The Grand Jury warrant includes all these charges. Their warrant will show what the amount is.

Cross-examination resumed.

3064. You give a contribution for the County Hospital—you are sure of that?—I don't know. I may be wrong.

3065. And that is for your own proportion?—That is for the county.

3066. The artisans you stated live in the city. When they are sick do they go to the City or to the County Hospital?—I think, to some extent, you are making a great mistake in supposing that all the artisans go to hospital when they are sick. The majority of my artisans, and also the artisans of other employers, are respectable men, able to pay for their own medicines, and not assisted by any such institutions; and I may further mention that one of the reasons given for the death rate of the city being so high, is that people come up from the country to procure relief in the Dublin hospitals, and die in them. When the hospitals are largely filled by such people, there is not much room for the Dublin artisan, who you think would seek an entrance into an hospital. But I don't think that they do seek, as a rule, entrance into such institutions. I deny that altogether.

3067. Suppose they occasionally fall into difficulties, where are their families relieved. As the artisans reside in Dublin, I presume they are relieved in the workhouses of the city?—Some of them are.

3068. At whose cost?—We pay our union rates.

3069. You do pay for Rathmines—for your own there—but you don't pay anything for the electoral division of the city?—No, not in Rathmines; but your contributions or donations to the hospitals are in your own hands. Let the Corporation withhold their subsidies to the hospitals, and let the hospitals be supported by the Union-at-large, and we will pay our share.

3070. That is an economical arrangement?—But it is quite possible to carry it out.

3071. Mr. Walker.—Don't you remember that these are voluntary contributions?—Yes, I do.

3072. Dr. Newseed.—Then you think it would be just for your township to pay a portion of those costs?—I would.

3073. They don't do so at present?—There are very few people that trouble the hospitals from Rathmines. The Rathmines people are all respectable people, and I am sure they all contribute their subscriptions to all the public institutions of the city, and in that way we contribute.

3074. Have you ever seen that map which the engineer has prepared, showing the drainage of the township?—Yes.

3075. Will we have an opportunity of seeing it?—I expect so.

3076. And it shows the house-drains of the township?—The engineer is here himself, and he will be able to tell you about it better than I can.

3077. Did you ever see that map?—Yes; it is hanging up in the board-room.

3078. Does it show the public as well as the private drains of the township?—You have no cause to show private drains.

3079. What does it show?—A great many of the railways are private roads.

3080. Does it show these private roads?—It would not have a right to show private roads. It should show the connection with the drainage of these private roads into the main sewer.

3081. Are you aware that such a map is absolutely necessary for public inspection?—Yes; and I am aware that he is working at it, and the maps are there for everyone to see; but I presume that none of the members of the Corporation see that Mr. Neville has his drainage works done at proper angles.

3082. Now, about those bigger barges. Do you think these larger canals are constructed for £150 a-pass?—I don't want to lay myself down to that. If they cost double my estimate they would be cheap, and the system better than the present system of arrangements. At present you have to drag horses up-

DUBLIN.
May 15, 1862
Mr. Edward
W. Bolton.

DUBLIN,
May 29, 1878.
Mr. Samuel
H. Tolson.

bill to distribute this staff, straining the horses and all that sort of thing, whereas down the Liffey the staff could be much more easily disposed of.

3083. Mr. Corcoran.—You said there was a good deal of vacant land eligible for building in Dublin?—Yes.

3084. Whereabouts is that land?—What land do you allude to?—At present there is a lot of building going on, or some time ago there was building going on, on the South Circular-road. That has all been, or is being built on in a few years.

3085. What land is vacant now?—Well, there is a lot of land on the Circular-road going down to Fitzwilliam-place. They have commenced building on one side now.

3086. Where?—From the head of Lower-street to Muckin's Church there is a whole lot of ground. There are plenty of localities in which there is vacant ground, but, from memory, at the present moment I cannot give you exactly the names of them.

3087. It was stated the other day that on the Rathgar-road there was not a single crossing for any of the roads running into it—that you had to go across in the mud on the right-hand side!—You are aware that the tramway company have taken charge of our crossings?

3088. But I allude to the crossings for the streets crossing into that road!—Our crossings are made of gravel. We have not many paved crossings. It has been under consideration for some time to give paved or asphaltic crossings.

3089. You would not put on asphaltic crossings?—It was myself suggested asphaltic crossings. You will see them at the North-wall, where the Steam Packet Company run their trucks. They are clean and dry, and can be easily kept clean.

3090. CHAIRMAN.—Are you aware that, in your return of the amount expended in 1877, £6 in the pound was all the money you laid out for the repair of the roads, and that you had to go into debt for it to the extent of 1*l*.*d.* in the pound to pay that?—It might be so.

3091. If it cost you that without making crossings, what would it cost you to put down all those crossings—that would cause you to go more into debt?—I heard you asking that question before. We are not bound by the same rules as the Corporation. As I understand the Corporation, Acts of Parliament require them to levy a borough rate and a sewer rate. We assess a certain lump sum—such a sum as we think we will require for the expenditure of the year, and we afterwards appropriate it as it is required.

3092. You are bound to keep the roads in proper repair, and you are bound to do that work without going into debt; but in the year 1877, after paying your expenses, you appear to have exceeded your income that year by 1*l*.*d.* in the pound.

3093. Mr. Sweene.—The debt that year was occasioned by the fact that we had to pay £500, which was the amount of the security of the collectors. It was not attributable to any bad management as regards the repairing of the roads. The several rate collectors had asked us to allow them to lodge money—the amount of their security—and we subsequently found it was not right to do that, and we had to return it. We handed back that money to them.

3094. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Andrews asked you were you satisfied with the sanitary arrangements and the work that is being done in Rathmines, and you said that since the Public Health Act of last year came into operation you were doing a good deal. Did you do anything before that?—We did.

3095. What? I have the accounts before me, and the whole of the sanitary work you did one year cost you £22, and there was another small sum expended in another year. You paid salaries to the amount of £120!—We do our work differently. You made a remark sometime in the inquiry about our paying £20 to the sanitary officer. We have an engineer and his assistant. I may tell you that we work our township in this way. We have our engineer—that is our

principal officer so far as the sanitary is concerned—and we have his assistant and another assistant, also a waterworks inspector and a sanitary inspector, and a man who never writes. We have directed that those men, in their various visits through the township, inspect the sanitary arrangements, and do, in every sense of the word, not as sanitary officers.

3096. What I asked was, what staff of sanitary officials you had, and you told me that you had that superintendent police officer at £20 a year, and another man at £15 as a sub-superintendent!—I think if we can get our sanitary work done for £10 a year, there is no necessity to spend £20.

3097. I want to know do you do your sanitary work at all?—I say we do.

3098. Did you ever hear of the Towns' Improvement Clauses Act of 1847?—I did.

3099. Has that Act ever been applied to your township, in reference to a paid surveyor, for instance; can you, of your own knowledge, state that?—What part of the Act do you refer to?

[The Chairman then read the 15th section of the Act.]

3100. Has that ever been done to your knowledge?—I don't think it has been done to the letter.

3101. Has it been done at all?—I say it has been done sufficiently for the wants of the locality.

3102. Will you show me anything that points to its being sufficient for the wants of the locality, because I have heard it said, and we were told, "Nothing was done, because we didn't think it necessary." I want to know, for instance, as to the surveyor, whether you carried out the Act in that regard, for you see he is to prepare a map of the drainage of the township, and it is to be corrected from time to time, in order that any intending builder may be shown at the moment he goes into the office, and informed as to the position of the drains. [Mr. Tolson then read the 15th section of the Act.] Has a single bit of that ever been done by the Rathmines Commissioners?—A great portion of that Act is obsolete.

3103. Indeed it is not. It is in force at this moment, and it is incorporated with your Act!—The Act of Parliament requires the levels to be marked on the corners of the houses, but it is never done.

[Chairman then read the 15th section again.]

3104. Has there been a map kept, in which from time to time, this has been done, and the Commissioners have seen that it is done, for the purpose of enabling any one coming into the office to know the state of the sublying ground, with regard to all pipes and sewers, pipes for water, gas, or drainage, or anything of that kind. Has that ever been done?—It is hanging up in the boardroom.

3105. Are you in a position to tell me that the requirements of the Act have been carried out to the last sewer that has been made?—Do you mean the drainage of the houses?

3106. Yes!—You must remember that every day there is, perhaps, a new erection in Rathmines, so that it would be impossible for a map to get down every day daily.

3107. He is required to mark on that map every new sewer, and every new street, and every new sewer in that street, and every new pipe that is laid down? That can be easily done.

3108. But is it done?—The surveyor will tell you.

3109. Dr. Newwood.—Mr. Tolson told me it was corrected from time to time!—You will see the map here.

3110. CHAIRMAN.—What I want to know is, have you, as Commissioners, ever taken the trouble to see that it has been done?—I have discussed the matter with my fellow-Commissioners, and pointed out to them the necessity for doing it.

3111. But has it ever been done?—Occasionally, as required.

3112. [The Chairman then read the 16th clause of the Towns' Improvement Clauses Act of 1847.]

Wilson.—You will see, by that clause, that we have a margin, "where we think well."

Dissent,
May 20, 1878.
Mr. Bassett
H. Bassett.

3113. Not at all. "The Commissioners may cause every such plan to be kept," &c., and the plan must be made, in order that intending builders may see it in the Town Commissioners' Office, and make a copy if they please, so as to show them where they will find a sewer, gas pipe, or water pipe in such and such different places!—The subject you have referred to has been under consideration, and we have insisted on the necessity of its being perfected, and being added to.

3114. Has it been done?—It is constantly being done.

3115. But it should be done according as each new sewer or drain is made!—We are not remissive, but I go in for the assertion that we are as good as any other Commissioners.

3116. You know very well, Mr. Bolton, as an owner of houses, and I suppose you have planned the sewage for your own houses from time to time, how important such a map must be in case anything went wrong. Any careful person would get such a map made when he is getting his house built, and anyone would suppose, with far greater reason, that the Town Commissioners would get the same thing done with regard to the whole township. [The Chairman then read section 17:—"The Commissioners shall cause plans to be made of existing works and any new works," &c., &c.] That is the Act of Parliament. Has that ever been done?—I have but the one answer, that we have our plans and our drainage; and, with reference to our new works, it is one of the rules of our Board that if any gentleman takes a piece of ground to speculate on it for building purposes, he makes the drains, and makes the roadway, and leaves it to the satisfaction of our engineer, before we take it off his hands, so that in that way we have taken every precaution to have this new district opened up and properly drained.

[The Chairman then read the 18th section of the same Act.]

3117. Have the provisions of that section been complied with to your knowledge? Have you made several new surveys?—We have.

3118. Have you had plans of these surveys made and deposited before they were sanctioned by the Commissioners?—Of course we approved of them. The engineer would not have power to lay out a penny without our sanction.

3119. I am only asking you were they deposited at the office of the Commissioners, and notice given that they were so deposited?—Notice to whom?

3120. To the public!—I cannot follow you in the reading of the *Act of Parliament*; it is not in my line.

3121. The section says: " . . . and all such plans shall be deposited in the office of the Commissioners, and shall be open at reasonable hours for inspection," and so on. That is, notice that a particular work is to be done according to a particular plan; and that section says that two months' notice is to be given—

Witness—I am afraid if all this was followed up, there would be very little building going on.

3122. Is there any book brought in showing the complaints of the sanitary officers, and letters read on the subject of sanitary matters?—Yes; that is done. Our sanitary committee meets at seven o'clock in the evening on two evenings of the month, and we have then our books before us with a schedule of the various complaints, with the name of the complainant, the report of the sanitary officer as to whether the place has been cleaned, or what the answer is, and we see each of them, and officially consider them.

3123. With regard to the smaller streets of Rathbones, as far as you know, are they scavenged regularly?—Yes.

3124. Every day!—Certainly.

3125. How often?—As often as they require it.

3126. You know that would be a very satisfactory way of looking at it. Are they scavenged once a week?—I don't know of any locality where the streets

are scavenged periodically, whether they require it or not.

3127. Then you would not sweep the streets perfectly clean!—All I can say as an active Commissioner myself is, that they sweep fairly to the scavenging, and fairly to the cleaning.

3128. How often are the small streets scavenged?—I can tell you this, that we have twenty-three men engaged in scavenging the township every day, and also eight horses; and, as an employer of labour, I consider that twenty-three men and eight horses ought fairly to do the work in the township.

3129. Mr. Heron.—For doing the work of cleaning twenty-three miles of roads!—Yes. Eight horses are found to be sufficient to do our work; we have had no complaint as to the horses.

3130. CHAIRMAN.—Do you get any report weekly or monthly as to the scavenging of the streets?—We do not require it, because we see it ourselves.

3131. Then you can tell me how often, in your opinion, are these small streets scavenged. I asked you it once a week, and you said "no"!—It would be folly to scavenge them once a week whether they wanted it or not.

3132. Are they done once a month?—I suppose on an average they would be done as often as that.

3133. Dr. Norwood.—Have you any returns as to how those twenty men and eight horses are employed?—We have returns. I have not attended to the committee lately; but when I was attending I saw them. We have returns showing the different works.

3134. CHAIRMAN.—Those men not only scavenge the streets, but repair the roads, and spread the staff!—Yes.

3135. And they also form part of the fire brigade at night!—Yes, fires don't take place, as a rule, in the day-time.

3136. These twenty men include the men who work the fire engine!—Yes.

3137. How long have you the ex-pollerman—since the Sanitary Act came into operation last year?—Yes.

3138. Had you anyone before that?—Yes, we had.

3139. And what salary did he get?—It is only since the Sanitary Act came into operation that we have paid anything worth calling a salary. The hall-penter did all the sanitary work before that for £15 a year.

3140. And had you a sub-sanitary officer then?—No.

3141. Under the Public Health Act of 1865, you should have had a sub-sanitary officer as well!—But we didn't require it.

3142. Will you show me anything in the *Act of Parliament* that says it is "only if you require it." You were bound to have such an officer!—This man acted as our sub-sanitary officer, and up to that time we considered him sufficient.

3143. If he was the sanitary officer, had you no sub-sanitary officer?—We had our medical men.

3144. Under the *Act in force before the one of last year*, you were bound to have a sanitary officer and a sub-sanitary officer!—Well, we didn't go in for anything on our staff in the shape of unnecessary officers.

3145. But the *Act of Parliament* required you to have them!—We might fulfil the terms of the *Act of Parliament* by putting on men to fill the different offices at a few shillings a week. But I maintain that we have done what is right; we have got our staff, and have met the requirements of the township.

3146. The *Act of Parliament* says you should have a sanitary officer, a sub-sanitary officer, and a consulting sanitary officer—everyone of those you should have had under the *Act of 1865*!—Very likely so.

3147. Dr. Norwood.—Where is the vehicle kept for the conveyance of persons who are suffering from infectious diseases to hospital?—We have not got one yet; it is ordered.

3148. Where is your disinfecting chamber?—We are not in a populous locality at all; we don't require those things.

3149. Then you have none?—No.

Belfast
May 18, 1878.
Mr. Samuel
H. Bolton.

3150. Where do you propose to keep this vehicle when you get it?—In our Commissioners' yard. We don't intend to use it ourselves. With reference to the sanitary officer; Mr. Commissioner, you spoke about him last night, as if a retired police constable was not a suitable officer for us to employ. We advertised, at the time we were about to make the appointment, for a sanitary officer, and out of 15 applicants we selected this man, and I was on the committee of selection. He was a man with a good character, excellent testimonials, and has a good pension.

3151. Mr. Waller.—Is there anyone more likely to be suited for the discharge of the duties than a retired sergeant of police?—Not one; and the committee that selected him were employers of labour, and they thought him the most suitable of the candidates.

3152. CHAIRMAN.—This man was only employed at £50 a year last February. In the year 1877 your salaries under the head of sanitary arrangements were £150 odd. Can you tell me how that was spent, because then all you had in the way of a staff, as far as I can make out, was this man at £15 a year, which he got in addition to his wages as hall-porter. Where was the difference made up for sanitary expenses, as the expenditure is returned as £127 10s.?

3153. Mr. Evans.—That is an arrear of two years of the odd salary as executive sanitary officer, and also this man's £15—the hall-porter's. That £127 10s. represents that year and the arrear of two former years.

3154. If you take £15 from that, it left £113 for the two years!—From 1874 it was by arrangement with the Local Government Board.

3155. If the man acted as hall-porter as well, was he not bound to be in attendance during the day at the Town Hall?—He was not bound to be there. He did all the duties of sanitary officer.

3156. What salary did he get for his duties as hall-porter?—He gets 16s. a week, as well as residence, coal, and gas.

3157. Mr. Cotton.—Is he doing at any particular hour?—He is bound to be there, but he has other duty to do if anyone comes in.

3158. CHAIRMAN.—There should be some one to take care of the Town Hall, because you are bound to have the maps there open to the inspection of everyone!—Mr. Evans is there all day. Our officers do not stand upon their dignity. Mr. Evans would show anyone the maps, or give any information that would be required.

3159. Dr. Norcross.—Mr. Bolton, you are a large employer of labour. Did you ever see such a return as has been spoken of, showing where the different men have been employed, and the time employed at particular places; the number of carts of soil removed, and where removed from? Did you ever see such a return as this (return handed to witness)?—Have you the dead man that was paid his wages in this?

3160. Where the stuff was removed from and where it was brought to—did you ever see such a return as that?—We have books similar to that.

3161. Are they kept?—Have you the whole of the time of your engineer employed and devoted to your service?—Very nearly, though an arrangement was made by which he should be allowed to transact some private business.

3162. Is it a fact that that gentleman is largely engaged in the discharge of private business?—Not largely.

3163. Is the greater part of his time devoted to the work of the Commissioners, or to his private affairs?—Seven-eighths of his time is devoted to us, I should say.

3164. Is there a return in your office of the time he employs himself upon your duty?—There is not.

3165. Then how do you base your calculations that seven-eighths of his time is devoted to your business?—Well, we see him about the township. The township

is not so large, but for myself I know what he is doing.

3166. But there is no return?—No, there is not.

3167. Mr. Heron.—Why are you opposed to having any staff in the nature of a fire brigade?—I am not opposed to any such thing.

3168. Have you any staff of the kind?—We have a sort of staff.

3169. A sort of staff?—Perhaps so.

3170. What staff have you?—All our officers feel interested in it.

Re-examined by Mr. Andrews.

3171. After all you have heard respecting the roads of Rathmines, and all the questions put to you in cross-examination—are your roads in Rathmines, as a matter of fact, better scavenged, and better maintained, than the roads and streets of Dublin?—I believe they are.

3172. One of the questions put to you by Dr. Newell was with reference to the residents of Rathmines using the streets of Dublin, and not paying for them. Is Mr. William Todd one of your Commissioners?—He is.

3173. He is senior partner in the firm of Todd, Burns, and Company?—Yes.

3174. Is Mr. Alexander Parker another of your Commissioners?—He is.

3175. He is a member of the firm of Farier, Pollock, and Company?—He is.

3176. And their valuation is £410 per annum in the City of Dublin?—Yes.

3177. Is Mr. Hugh Brown another of your Commissioners?—Yes.

3178. And he is a member of the firm of Brown, Thomas, and Co.?—Yes.

3179. And their valuation is £670?—Yes.

3180. Is Mr. William Aikens another of your Commissioners?—Yes.

3181. And he is a member of the firm of McElroy and Company?—Yes.

3182. And is not Mr. J. G. Deasy another of your Commissioners?—Yes.

3183. And he is a member of the firm of Thomas Deasy and Co.?—Yes.

3184. Mr. Edward M. Hodges is another of your Commissioners?—Yes.

3185. He resides at Richmond, and is a member of the firm of McElroy, Hodges, and Co.?—Yes.

3186. And is not Mr. Alfred Henshaw another of your Commissioners?—Yes.

3187. And he is a member of the firm of Thomas Henshaw and Sons, Dublin?—Yes.

3188. Mr. Thomas Sibthorpe is another of your Commissioners, I believe?—Yes.

3189. And he is a member of the firm of Sibthorpe and Sons, of Cork Hill, Dublin?—Yes.

3190. Now, don't all those gentlemen pay a pretty good contribution to Dublin taxation—do they not?—They do.

3191. CHAIRMAN.—There are two other matters connected with the Public Health Act about which I wish to ask you. Are there any lodging-houses in Rathmines?—Very few, I believe. I don't think any of them come under the designation of night lodging-houses at all.

3192. Are there any licensed lodging-houses in the township?—I think not any under that designation.

3193. Do you know that you never had a by-law for regulating licensed slaughter-houses?—Well, as a matter of fact, the by-law never was required. If a slaughter-house was not properly cleaned we would take away the license.

3194. Mr. Heron.—Whose duty is it to inspect the slaughter-houses?—Well, our road inspector, a man named Smith, a very intelligent fellow, performs that duty.

3195. CHAIRMAN.—Did you ever take away the license from a slaughter-house?—We did not.

3196. Would you tell me under what Act of Par-

lement you would take his house away. You have power to make him keep his place clean by by-laws, and then to punish him if he does not do so—but under what Act of Parliament would you take his house away?—The butchers in our township are a very respectable class of tradesmen, and if their places are not kept clean all they have to do is to be spoken to, and I don't think that even that has been required.

3197. Did you know that the Act of Parliament required you to have by-laws for slaughter-houses, and the Commissioners to make them. Did you ever know that before?—I did not; still I knew that the slaughter houses were kept in good order. I should wish to mention, before the close of my examination, a matter personal to myself. It was stated by some gentleman in the early part of the inquiry, that I transferred my business establishment to the other side of Portobello-bridge to avoid the increased taxation of the city. I beg to say now that that is not the case. Any business man knows that position is worth more than taxation; and I merely transferred my business place to the present site because I could not get a place in the city that would give me sufficient

room where I wanted it. As a matter of fact, I had no space in the South Circular-road procurable, and I had to give up my premises there. The great difficulty was to get space, and I could only obtain that at the other side of the bridge. Still I have property in the city, and premises which are paying taxes. The township Commissioners have been accused of being jealous of the Corporation interfering with them. I was a member of the Main Drainage Board under Mr. Neville and Mr. Bassigeito, and we attended faithfully to our duties here, and, owing to our attendance very frequently it was there that we got to carry on the business. We were accused of over-reaching; and when we started a scheme of drainage of our own, the joint scheme proving abortive, we were thwarted, and had to undergo a considerable contest in the House of Lords in order to carry that scheme, and the result proves that the bargain made by the late Sir John Gray and Mr. Stokes was a reasonable one, for half the expenditure that we are going to now would be about the sum originally intended for the joint scheme capitalised; so that between the two corporations, it would have been a fair bargain in my opinion.

EDINBURGH,
May 28, 1881.
Mr. Samuel
H. Bolton.

MR. MICHAEL MURRAY, examined.

Mr. Michael
Murphy.

3198. Mr. Walker.—Have you considerable property in the Ruthinians township?—I have some property in that township.

3199. Where is it situated?—It lies altogether within Ruthinians proper.

3200. That is made of Rathgar or Harold's-cross?—No; it is Ruthinians proper that my property is in.

3201. You know Wingfield?—Yes. That is portion of one denomination of my property.

3202. And Kenilworth-square?—Yes; that is another denomination.

3203. When did you come into possession of Wingfield?—In 1849.

3204. And of Kenilworth-square?—In 1852.

3205. How much land is comprised in those two denominations?—About seventy acres.

3206. Is that covered with buildings?—Every inch, according to the original plan, is covered with buildings.

3207. Were they all constructed by you?—I am only the ground landlord. In fact, it was comparatively unbuilt on when I got it.

3208. Did you make the roads yourself?—I cut the whole thing out for building, arranged the plots, and laid out the roads. I did the Wingfield and the Kenilworth-square altogether myself, for my confidence was so great in the future of the township that I looked upon it scarcely as a speculation, but as a certainty, for ground as near the city as that would be valuable for agricultural purposes in any case, and could be used as market gardens, and even then it would fetch a high rent. I had, however, no idea of failure, and so I laid out the whole thing in building lots. Had that failed, the loss to me then would have been entire, because I had no opportunity of letting for agricultural purposes.

3209. How much was expended by your sub-lessees?—About £120,000.

3210. Was that expended on the faith of its continuing a township?—Yes, by my sub-lessees.

3211. Had you a considerable expenditure yourself also?—A little under £30,000.

3212. Was that expended on the faith of its being in future a township?—Altogether on the faith of the future township. I would not have had a penny out if I thought it would have anything to do with the Corporation.

3213. Were these roads properly constructed?—They were very well constructed. I may tell you as a Commissioner myself, that there is a rule on the Board, and a very stringent one, and if you go to speculate, as I have done, you are watched at every

step by the Commissioners, so that you cannot get a penny of the ratepayers' money to further your own speculations; and as you are taking about roads, the surveyor, who is in all cases obliged to give a report, reported about those roads—and I think they were the best roads made in the township—that they were pretty good, that they should be twelve months in traffic, and after they had been that, they were obliged to be remade, and during that time the building was going on.

3214. Are all the roads properly looked after, and properly paved and scavenged?—I heard a question of the Commissioners to Mr. Bolton to the same effect, and I must say that I don't think in any portion of England I have been in—and I have been a good deal in England and Scotland, and I have been also in France—and I never saw anything so well done as we have these things done in Ruthinians, excepting in Paris, of course.

3215. Do you know what the feeling of the township is upon the matter of annexation?—It is decidedly adverse. I don't mean to say that it is all unanimous, for you would never get 20,000 people to be unanimous upon anything.

3216. Are you satisfied with the representation of the Commissioners and their management of the township?—I think it is excellent. I think there is an amount of liberality on the Board that is perhaps unequalled nowhere else. For instance, the majority of the members are men with large holdings, but there is always a certain amount of seats reserved for gentlemen who have no interest in the township beyond the house they occupy, and pay a rack-rent for, and it is always considered fair that the occupiers should have representation.

3217. How do you mean that there are a certain number of seats reserved?—We always admit that there should be so many—some three or four that have not actually any property in the township that should represent the occupiers.

3218. And so they are elected?—Yes; we often elect.

3219. But that is only in case there is a vacancy?—Yes; and they have always been returned by the rate-payers.

3220. As a rule do the ratepayers adopt the members proposed by the Board?—Yes, almost everything the Commissioners do in fact.

3221. Mr. Walker.—However, you are perfectly satisfied with the representation by the Commissioners and their management?—I am perfectly satisfied with both.

DUBLIN
May 20, 1873.
Mr. Michael Murphy.

3232. CHAIRMAN.—Are the sanitary matters looked after properly, as far as you know?—They are well looked after.

3233. I suppose you know Dublin pretty well?—I do, well.

3234. And its streets and management?—Yes.

3235. In your opinion does the management of the Rathmines streets and their scavenging contract favourably with Dublin?—To give individual instances is the best way to prove the case; but I can give you no instance in the case of Rathmines that would contrast unfavourably with the city, because I know of no instance where a heap of road stuff was swept up today, and not removed before to-morrow; and I had one of those malcontents with me about two years ago complaining that the Rathgar road was full of mud holes, and I asked him when they were put there, and he said that morning, and I told him it would surprise me very much if they were not removed the next morning, and he subsequently told me that they were. There are, I am glad to say, very few malcontents in the township. I live in Belvidere-place, within two dozen of Mountjoy-square. It is not very long since Upper Gardiner-street was in a disgraceful condition. I walked it every day for three weeks. The mud was churned up and down, and at last it became offensive, and there was no scavenging there for three weeks. That was about three years ago. It was not recently.

Cross-examined by Mr. Heron.

3236. You hold your council in private?—Yes; but we are obliged to leave our books open for examination at any convenient time; and, as you are aware, we are obliged to send in a copy of our minutes to the Local Government Board.

3237. Do you consider it advantageous to have the press excluded?—I don't think men would remain if it was open to the press. We go in for business.

3238. Why would not men remain on the Board if the press were admitted?—Because we would be all studying our speeches. You would yourself. The minute that began we would have no business; business could not be done. We begin at nine o'clock in the morning, and you will see an amount of work done there before an hour that you would not see in another Corporation done in three weeks.

3239. You meet once a month?—Yes; and then in addition to that we have our finance meetings and other meetings going on.

3240. And the business is punctually done in one hour every month?—I don't say that, nor did I say it. What I did say was, that you would be surprised at the amount of business we do in an hour. Oh, no, we often stay there two or three hours.

3241. Who are the malcontents?—It would not be fair to ask me. The leader of them is a most respectable man—a man with a fine property, and a man that we would wish to have with us.

3242. But there are malcontents?—Yes; very few though.

3243. Are you one of the Commissioners who are opposed to having a fire brigade staff?—No; on the contrary, I am quite prepared to advocate the side of a fire brigade staff under the arrangement that we made with the late Sir John Gray—that we would be contributory to the Dublin brigade, and, in case of fire, that we would contribute a certain amount; but to have a distinct and separate one, on something of the principle of the Dublin one, I would be opposed to that. For the present I consider that we have an efficient and good staff.

3244. Oh, you have an efficient and good one?—Yes, an efficient and good staff.

3245. How many does your staff consist of?—We have our engine in our work-yard; and our horses there ready. We have a man always on the premises, and he has the addresses of all our men.

3246. What did you pay for your engine?—We got a present of it from an insurance company.

3247. I suppose it was half worn out?—I think it was new, and one of the best engines.

3248. Why did they make you a present of it?—I think you will always find that when people are prosperous there are a great many compliments paid to them. Poor people would not get a present of that sort.

3249. When did you get that?—Ten years ago.

3250. Which company was it gave it to you?—I think it was the Patriotic Company.

3251. You say you have eight horses?—Yes, I think so.

3252. Are those the horses engaged in the scavenging?—Yes, those are they.

3253. Now, were these horses ever galloped with the fire engine?—No, but I think they could gallop four miles just as fast as some of Captain Ingram's. They are as fine horses as you would see, except those from Sir Arthur Guinness or some of those crack stables.

3254. Fine big cart horses?—Better, than that—bitter breed and a little "go" in them.

3255. Those are the horses engaged in the scavenging carts?—Yes.

3256. You don't call them part of the staff of the fire brigade?—I do.

3257. Mr. Bolton did not apparently mention them. Was he not an experienced fireman?—We have a man named Smith, who is up to everything in the way of the management of machinery. He is as good a mechanist as any you would get. We have Mr. Johnston, who lives beside where our engine is stationed, and all the men are within easy hailing distance.

3258. You would not call Mr. Johnston a fireman?—Yes, in fact our men all take a turn at everything.

3259. Is the hall porter on the fire brigade?—He would be.

3260. Is he paid anything for that?—No. You are aware that the Local Government Board would not sanction that.

3261. Are these other men paid for being on the fire brigade?—They are not.

3262. Then it is an amateur brigade?—Except that they have a good deal of fire brigade knowledge. Yes, except for that. I know of amateur bands, but never heard of an amateur fire brigade.

3263. Then they are by no means uncommon. There is one at Newry, one at Dandale, and one at Belfast?—But it does not follow that because the Act of Parliament says you are to have three men employed to do such and such work that you are to employ that number when it is not necessary to do so. I think it would be a great piece of nonsense to employ three men if one would do. That is the principle we have acted on all through.

3264. And that is the same principle that you set out as regards the sanitary staff?—It is the sanitary staff I am alluding to in reference to my remarks just now.

3265. How long have you had the retired constable?—Not so very long.

3266. And, according to this account, he is paid £50 a year, and another man £15 a year. Are they enough to walk over twenty-two miles of roads and inspect them?—No; they would not be enough to walk ten miles in Dublin, but they are enough for our requirements, because we have so little sanitary wants, and the place is so well kept, and they know where to give their information, because if Mr. Evans is not in, his assistant is there.

3267. Did you ever see a map of the sewers of Rathmines?—Yes; it is a good map.

3268. How long has it been in existence?—I don't know how long it has existed in its present state, but I know that it was not in consequence of this inquiry that it was got up. I am pretty well interested in the township. I knew it since 1838, when the township first came into existence. We were first Rathmines, then we took in Rathgar, and then Harold's-cross; and, of course, the arrangements we had for the one in the beginning would not be suffi-

DUBLIN,
May 19, 1873.
Mr Michael
Murphy.

cient for the three. Then the scavenging, and everything in connexion with the sanitary arrangements and scavenging, if I may use the word, were so perfect or nearly so, that we didn't need more; and if we wanted ten men we could have them in an hour.

3259. Do you like the canal water?—I do.

3260. It is wholesome!—Yes.

3261. You like it better than the Ventry?—I don't say that.

3262. Do you think it is better?—I think it is more abundant. We have water that is good enough, but we want pressure. As far as saying that one water is better than another, there are very few men who can analyse good water. Did you ever try the canal water? Did you ever see our system of filtration?

3263. I don't believe in any filtration, so far as getting rid of the organic part of the admixture is concerned!—Well, Professor Cameron and Emerson Reynolds—and I don't think you will go beyond those as good authorities—have made a report on the water. The Commissioners alluded pretty strongly to it the other day, and I am sure you would not give your opinion as opposed to them.

3264. But then you meet the most injurious things after the filtration!—Not in the Rathmines water, but in the Ventry.

3265. Do you mean to say that the water from the canal is purer than the water from the Ventry?—That is what you must read, according to the analysis.

3266. If you think so, I will ask you no more about that!—I am not sufficient to form an opinion, but I have the good sense to follow those who have the power of forming an opinion; and I have only to quote the opinion of Professor Reynolds and of Professor Cameron.

3267. Therefore, you are opposed to the bringing in of the Ventry water?—Certainly.

3268. On the ground of expense, or of the superiority of the canal water?—On the ground, in the first place, that we have good water, and that we never would turn out the water we have to go in for the Ventry.

3269. Then why are you seeking another supply?—Because we want pressure.

3270. And the sole reason of going to an expense of £80,000 is the want of pressure!—There is no going to an expense of £80,000.

3271. Mr. Hassard said it would cost you that sum!—That is what he said, but we didn't adopt it. We have another scheme; but when we go higher up on the canal, we will get a higher pressure for less money.

3272. And would the water be pure too high up?—We would put up some system of filtration; but whether it is the canal water, or the water from the source of the Dodder that we will have I cannot say. Whatever is best we will have. If the analysis of the distant one is better than the nearest one, that is the one we will have.

3273. But you can never purify dirty water!—You are making a mistake in pronouncing any opinion. At what you are doing you are very good, but you are not a good chemist.

3274. I saw sewage water the other day bottled in a bottle, and it was perfectly bright and sparkling!—Well, the Apothecaries' Hall, Bowley and Draper, and all the soda-water makers, for a long time used the water of the Carton pump, whence that pump was found to have the most organic matter in it.

3275. CHAINMAN.—How often are the by-streets scavenged?—I heard you speak a good deal about that to Mr. Bolton, and perhaps I could enlighten you on the subject. There is no street, lane, or alley that is ever allowed to accumulate scavenging matter of any sort. I don't mean to tell you either that every day of the week the scavengers go here and there in particular, but they are all over the township, and a good many of the Commissioners go from time to time through the township, and whenever a bit of scavenging is required it is done, so that I

am quite satisfied with the work, and that the scavenging cannot be better done than it is; and I am quite open to challenge anyone upon any portion of the township. I take a great deal of interest in it, and although I cannot do any more good for myself, I am morally bound to look after my sub-leases.

3276. Don't the people resident there use the streets of Dublin largely, and contribute to wear them out, and to soil and dirty them?—I heard a good many remarks about that, and I never heard so much extreme absurdity coming from a lot of men who put up for a little sense. The argument that the Corporation use is that the inhabitants of Rathmines use the city streets, and do not contribute to their support in the proportion that they should. I could suppose all that to be arguable, supposing it was a case of crossing a boundary wall. I don't think when you come to strike a balance there would be much either way. If you take into account the quantity of building stone brought through the township to the city from the Black Cap district—the Black Cap road material, and then take into account the Rubble stone brought from the mountains, and take the Wyne stone from Ballybrack—all these are used in the city for road material, and for building purposes in town, and to reach that district they must go over our district. If you average the amount of those carts so heavily laden, which go over our township into the city, I don't think all the rest we do would do as much mischief to the city as the building material does to us. The city takes all the road material from Bohernabreena to the Black Cap.

3277. About 20,000 tons. Mr. Bolton put it down at that, including, as he said, sand—I don't think Mr. Bolton goes to the half of it.

3278. Did you ever make a calculation of the quantity of coal that goes into your township, and of the timber and other materials, and of the imported bricks, and so on, that are brought from the city into Rathmines?—No.

3279. Or did you ever, now, take a doctor and creditor account of the quantity of stone that passes over your township to the city, and also what comes the other way?—No, but you take no account of the agricultural produce brought into the city through our township, and the carts that bring in the agricultural produce being sent manure on our roads again.

3280. Still, do you think, taking a doctor and creditor account, there would be a pretty even balance on both sides?—I think we would not have much the advantage.

3281. We have had it in evidence, and we all know, that merchants, solicitors, and other professional men, who go into their places of business in the city, live in these townships, while they have all their papers, and everything valuable of that sort, locked up in their offices in Dublin, and they also use the streets of Dublin for the purpose of coming in and going out again. They have their offices, many of them solicitors, at such places as 43, Dame-street, the Commercial Buildings, and so on, and they are not rated to pay one farthing to Dublin!—I don't think that. I think if you go into the matter particularly, unless I am mistaken, I think I will show you that it is quite another thing. Look at the number of heavy rate-payers in the city who are on our board, such as Mr. Todd, of Todd and Burns, Mr. Alexander Parker, Mr. Aitken, and others.

3282. I am not putting their case individually, because they do undoubtedly pay largely. But what I say is that if you go to 43, Dame-street, and count the number of persons living in Rathmines, who have merely offices in 43, Dame-street or Leinster Chambers, and then went through a list of the number of gentlemen having only offices in the Commercial Buildings, you would see that not one of them is rated to Dublin. They all live in Rathmines and go in daily and use Dublin—coming in and out simply for their business purposes. They get the benefit of having the fire brigade at hand in case danger to any

Dennis
May 19, 1873.
Mr. Michael
Murphy

of their valuable property is threatened by fire. Is it right that those people should not pay something toward the city that they use so largely?—If you tried to make your argument so strong that they receive all the benefit of Rathmines you would be right. But you are not right. For instance, if you live in Rathmines you get your household requisites and clothes from the city. If you have a family the members of it go into town to shop, market, or do their multiplicity of trades that they cannot get in without going to the city, and I think therefore that the city has the benefit of having our custom.

3283. And in the same way you cannot go to the places of amusement without going to the city. The people of Rathmines, Rathgar, and Penbaeke, when they go to all their amusements, such as the theatres and so on, use the city for the purposes of their amusement, and in the same way they use the schools of the city for their children. Is it not right that they should contribute something to the support of the city which they use so much in the way that I have described?—Well, on the other hand, gentlemen in the city make perhaps more excursions to the mountainous part, the hilly part of the county Dublin, than are made into the city—for instance, to that agreeable little club held at St. Ann's on a Saturday—and you cannot reach those places without going over our township. I never could see the advantage we derived in that way at all. On the contrary, I think the argument was a most extraordinary one.

3284. Take, for instance, the two streets, Upper Bagget-street and Upper Leeson-street; they are separated the one from the other merely by the canal, which happens to divide them. If it was not there, they would be built on continuously. Is it right that one should be in the city and the other in the township?—That is another argument that I have heard twenty times, although, in my opinion, it was most extraordinary to put it forth at all. You will admit that the township must somewhere; you will admit that Rathmines ends somewhere, and that the Corporation are anxious to get that somewhere into their own district. When you draw the line at the extreme boundary of the Rathmines district, and if you cross over that boundary are you not outside of it, although you have the benefit of the lights and roads coming up to that boundary the minute you cross outside.

3285. The Corporation proposed not only to take you in but also to get Terenure and Milltown, and they ask it because they say that should the city be attached to Rathmines, inasmuch as those places form a rural part of Rathmines, they should not have gas and water and everything of that sort provided for them out to the extremity of Rathmines, without paying for it!—With reference to all those imaginary places, so far as boundary is concerned, such as Rathmines, Rathfarnham, Terenure, and such places, beyond the township, when you come to the end of the township you set off the boundary, and when you have so decided it, it is only an imaginary line. If you step beyond our stone at Terenure, the minute you go beyond that stone you are outside that township. Will the Corporation want to extend the boundary and go outside it?

3286. That is all very well as an argument, but suppose Rathmines remains a township by itself, is it your idea that Milltown and Terenure, and very populous surrounding district, should be added to Rathmines?—It is my opinion that it should.

3287. That Rathmines should be extended by adding those districts to it!—At present we are trying to take in the Milltown people, but we found great diffi-

culty on account of the sewage there; but by the recent main drainage system we are trying, it is possible we can take them in.

3288. You cannot take them in without obtaining a private Act for that purpose?—Yes, they would have to go in for a private Act.

3289. We are now inquiring into the extension of Rathmines *per se*, or of adding it to Dublin. Is it your opinion that Milltown and Terenure, and the densely-populated portion of the surrounding districts, should be added to the township?—Is it my opinion? You did not put the question straight that way before, that Terenure should be added to the township.

3290. And Milltown?—With regard to Terenure, you mean the little city or town of Terenure or Roanstown. You cannot pick the eye out of a district and take it in. You could not take the township of Terenure in alone; you must take the whole townland in.

3291. Mr. Corcoran.—Could you take in the portion coloured yellow on that map?—I don't know what the extreme boundary of that is.

3292. Well, take it at half a mile outside your boundary!—In 1847 you could not pick the eye out of a district; you should take in the entire townland. Mr. Evans, however, reminds me that that law does not apply now. Taking in the town alone of Terenure, I think it would be a very reasonable thing for the people to expect or to ask for it.

3293. Do you think it should be added to Rathmines?—I don't know but there may be some difficulties which may be insuperable.

3294. You know no reason, from your knowledge of the country, why it should not?—I know nothing from my knowledge of the country, that it should be.

3295. You see, on referring to the map, that in reference to Milltown there is a curious boundary. It is coloured yellow. Would you suggest that the boundary of the Rathmines township should be extended from the south-east corner of Penbaeke to the south-west corner of Milltown?—Yes.

3296. Would you suggest that?—I would say, that if there was a requisition coming in from the inhabitants of the district, that it is a thing that we should take into consideration, and, if it should be done, to add it.

3297. Suppose, however, that they don't send in a requisition?—

3298. Mr. Evans.—They purpose appearing before you.

3299. Mr. Park Neville.—Terenure is a townland, and Milltown is a townland.

Witness.—The town of Terenure is a town, but it is only part of the entire townland.

3300. CHAIRMAN.—We are not bound to recommend an extension to take in the whole of a townland, provided that we can get some well-defined boundary so as to mark it out. Do you see on the map the portions coloured yellow and marked Dolphin's-barn and Roanstown?—Yes.

3301. Would you, on the part of the Commissioners of Rathmines, suggest that Roanstown and Dolphin's-barn, the portions coloured yellow, should be added to the township of Rathmines?—I would not say at present to extend to Dolphin's-barn; but I have no objection to Terenure and Milltown. I repeat again that we have had the case of Milltown, on and off, before us for the last ten years, trying to make some arrangement with regard to the sewerage; but now our own main drainage has got us over that difficulty.

3302. Mr. Evans.—I may mention that the townland of Terenure is so large as the whole of Rathmines.

3303. Mr. Murphy.—Six shillings in the pound would not do the work if we were to take in the Terenure townland.

Mr. CHARLES EASON.

BERLIN.
Aug 26, 1871
Mr. Charles
Eason.

3304. Mr. Andrews.—I believe you are a Commissioner of the Rathmines township?—Yes; a very recent one.

3305. And I believe you are the representative in Ireland of the well known firm of Messrs. W. H. Smith and Sons?—I am.

3306. Have you paid attention to the question of public health?—I have.

3307. Are you upon the Public Health Committee of the Rathmines township?—I am.

3308. Would the weekly returns of the Registrar-General, taken at different selected dates, afford any true index of the sanitary condition of the district?—None whatever.

3309. For instance, if you took a week at random, such as the 6th of June, 1873, you would find that the death rate in Dublin was 29·9 per thousand of the population, and in Rathmines and other districts 24, which would not accurately represent either of them?—It would not.

3310. Have you taken from the Registrar-General's returns the annual death rate for a series of years, beginning in 1873 and ending in 1879?—I have.

3311. And do you consider that those returns afford a true index of the sanitary condition of those respective districts?—They do.

3312. Give the Commissioners the result of that investigation?—In 1873 the named death rate of Dublin, North and South, is given by the Registrar-General as 28·0 per 1,000; Rathmines and other districts, 19·0 per 1,000. In 1874 it is given respectively as 26·0 per 1,000, and 20·0 per 1,000, Dublin being the first named. In 1875 it is given as 27·0 per 1,000 and 20·0 per 1,000; in 1876, 25·7 and 20; 1877, 23·7 and 20·4; 1878, 30·5, and 20·8. For the first quarter of 1879 the return is, for Dublin, 43·0, Rathmines, &c., 29·7. That was for the exceptionally severe period which we had this winter.

3313. Have you also taken the trouble, Mr. Eason, to investigate the number of cases of syphilitic disease occurring since July, 1876, which will be found as returned from the respective districts?—I have.

3314. Give the Commissioners the number of cases of syphilitic disease monthly from 1876 to the present time, first in the city and next in the suburbs?—On September 30th, 1876, which is the first date on which the syphilitic diseases were specially separated by the Registrar-General in his return, and I may also add the first date on which the Registrar-General discriminated in order the patients in the hospital district, debiting the persons who came from outside the district to their particular district. The returns are given as follows:—For the quarter ending September 30th, the city showed a proportion of 3·5 and the suburbs of 2·7.

3315. That is in 1876?—Yes.

3316. CHAIRMAN.—By "the suburbs" do you mean the entire of the districts of Clontarf, Kilmainham, and all those places surrounding the city?—Yes, the entire of the districts. For quarter ending December 31st it was 3·6 in the city against 2·1 in the suburbs; March 31st, 1877, it was 3·5 against 2·3; June 30th it was 4·5 to 1·6; September 30th it was 5·8 to 2·4; December 31st it was 4·6 to 2·6; March 31st, 1878, it was 4·8 to 2·3; June 30th it was 6·9 to 3·2; September 30th it was 7·3 to 3·3; December 31st it was 5·5 to 2·1; March 31st, 1879, it was 8·1 to 4·2.

3317. Mr. Andrews.—So that you have as against Dublin a percentage of something about 50 per cent. on an average of additional syphilitic disease to what you have in the suburbs?—Yes.

3318. I wish to understand what you mentioned just this moment—that since June, 1876, the Registrar-General allocates the deaths in the hospitals or institutions of that kind in Dublin to the districts from which the patients come?—He does.

3319. There is another observation I wish to put

to you, and to know whether my view is a sound one. Are those death rates each calculated on the population of 1871?—They are.

3320. Has the population of the city declined since 1871?—It has.

3321. Has the population of the township and the suburbs increased since 1871?—Yes, it has been increasing.

3322. And therefore those returns are too favorable towards Dublin?—Unquestionably.

3323. Have you considered the question of the use of the streets and roads of Dublin by the inhabitants of the suburbs?—I have.

3324. Will you be good enough to give the Commissioners your views on that subject?—I have a conviction very strongly that the profits of trade which are derived in the city from the dealings of the residents in the district outside the city with the city, are of such a character as to carry with them the expenses of the rates which belong to the trading portion of the inhabitants of the city. Of course that applies only so far as the merchants and traders of the city are concerned.

3325. Is there, according to your judgment, an unfair use of the streets of Dublin, having regard to the use the streets of the townships are subjected to by the inhabitants of Dublin?—I think not.

3326. You think the use by each is about reciprocal?—Yes.

3327. From the experience you have had, and the observations you have made, of Rathmines, is the municipal government there satisfactory?—I have been resident for 21 years in Rathmines, and I have always felt that the conduct of the township affairs has been satisfactory.

3328. Is it economical?—Thoroughly economical.

3329. Are your roads and thoroughfares thoroughly cleaned?—I think so.

3330. And are they properly maintained?—I think so, when compared with other roads in other districts governed by municipal bodies, and with other cities in Ireland and Great Britain.

3331. As a member of the Public Health Committee, has your attention been specially directed to scavenging and sanitary matters of that kind?—It has.

3332. With reference to the proposed amalgamation, have you considered the expediency and fairness of that scheme?—I do not think it would be at all fair, on the basis which was referred to, and which was submitted as the last and final proposition of the Corporation—that is, that we are to come in on anything like a part-pension position.

3333. Do you think you would find additional efficiency or additional competency in the management of your township by going to Dublin?—I don't think we would. It appears to me that there is an inherent defect connected with all moving bodies, and that is, that you cannot get a succession of men competent to regulate and control the conditions of affairs in them. For a particular time, during the presence of some particular mind of power in a Corporation, you may see during his continuance in that Corporation particular vigour and energy in it, yet the transitory character of his position, and the motives which often lead to his rejection from the Corporation, and his rejection by the community, because of some technical or personal matter on his part, irrespective altogether of the question of his being competent to oversee and control such undertakings, or the unfitness of his successor for the duty, create an objection. These things seem to me to be an inherent source of weakness in all corporate undertakings. Constantly we find a man of real competency, able to regulate and control large undertakings of that character, excluded from his membership for some trifling and temporary purpose, for which he is dispensed with, and the general community, and the Corporation as well, lose the advantages of that com-

DUBLIN,
May 16, 1873.
Mr Charles
Evans.

tral. It will always be an inherent weakness in connection with Corporations, when you associate them with the large duties which devolve upon them as controllers of the great public interests of the country.

3343. CHAIRMAN.—Do you confine that observation to the Dublin Corporation alone?—I apply it to all Corporations, but I think it applies particularly to the Dublin Corporation.

3344. As you say you have a great deal of experience, will you tell me a single Corporation in England against which such a complaint has been made? Has it ever been made of Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, or any of those great towns?—It has been made—I am quite certain of this—in the past, against several towns, that they have been governed by political rather than by practical considerations.

3345. I am talking of recent years!—I am quite certain that it has occurred.

3346. Mr. Finn gives us evidence of the enormous amount of money dealt with by such bodies. Could you name a single Corporation against which, in recent years, you have heard any complaint of that kind?—I cannot give you names.

3347. Mr. Andrews.—Is your judgment this—that government by Commissioners is a more efficient form of government than government by Corporations?—Yes, it is.

3348. Have you any serious defect in your Board of Commissioners which you could hope to rectify by being united to Dublin?—I don't know that we have.

3349. Have you any serious defects to complain of at all?—Well, I think there are defects in connection with the conduct of the townships which the provisions of the Public Health Act of last year will enable us to remove, but it requires time to mature and to spread out the machinery for the accomplishment of these works.

3350. Have you within yourselves sufficient means of doing that?—I think we have.

3351. And are well disposed to do it?—We are.

3352. Would it be just in your judgment to transfer the control of the township to the Corporation of Dublin?—I don't think it would, on the basis which has been proposed.

3353. Has the Dublin Corporation ever displayed such vast administrative power as to entitle them to a larger field of operations?—That is where the great difficulty is. There are many defects in the Dublin Corporation, which, if corrected, so that if Dublin came with a clean and effective bill of health before this Commission, and exhibited its competency to conduct the affairs of the township in addition to its own, it might be possible that a verdict might be obtained in its favour; but at present I dispute altogether the claim.

3354. So you think it should put its own house in order before it extends its operations?—Yes, quite so.

Cross-examined by Dr. Norwood.

3355. That inherent defect in Corporations stops short of Rathmines?—No, I don't think so, I think that in Rathmines, and in all the townships that have been constituted under the provisions of the Acts which regulate them, whether by the general Act, or by special private Acts obtained for themselves, there is one provision which is essentially of public advantage, and that is a continuing chairman.

3356. And the privilege of co-opting your own members?—I don't know anything of that.

3357. Has it not happened in Rathmines that you have a party of successors in a way objected to by the rate-payers?—I have not known that.

3358. Have you ever known Commissioners of Rathmines removed from office by the votes of the rate-payers, and then co-opted by their brother Commissioners?—I have.

3359. That has occurred!—That has occurred. It has occurred particularly in the case of one gentleman

who has preferred evidence here, and that is Mr. Bentley.

3360. Has it occurred in any other case?—I don't know whether it has or not. I think there have been other cases, but the names of the gentlemen I cannot now remember.

3361. Would you be surprised to learn that it occurred twice in the case of one gentleman?—Possibly so; I could not remember. The co-opting principle I never approved of, and I never would consent to set under it.

3362. You have been giving us some interesting statistics with regard to the sanitary condition and the death-rate in Rathmines. Do you attribute the favourable result you showed for Rathmines by those statistics to the excellence of the sanitary arrangements in Rathmines?—I do, to a very large extent.

3363. I suppose those sanitary arrangements which you consider excellent were brought about by the admirable staff you have in operation there?—Well, as a matter of fact, I think they are due very much to the natural advantages, and the circumstance that Rathmines is comparatively a new district.

3364. It is, as you are aware—and I am coming to you for an opinion on the subject—it is attributed to the Dublin Corporation that in consequence of their shortcomings the death-rate of Dublin has reached an undue magnitude!—It is.

3365. And in contradistinction to that you have been giving us some statistical information which would lead to the conclusion that you suppose that the better condition in sanitary matters in Rathmines is due to the excellent management of the Commissioners?—No.

3366. Then what is the value of your observations?—I wish to discriminate upon that point. The object of my producing these facts was to upset the theory which was adopted by two gentlemen, members of the Corporation, with regard to the health of Rathmines and the city respectively, and they constructed their theories upon the base of special returns for particular weeks. I say that such a method for examining the statistics as that is totally fallacious, because these weeks should be picked out indifferently. All those familiar with statistics know that very well.

3367. And you very properly did not confine yourself to any indefinite period, but thought it just to extend your observations over a year?—Quite so, I did.

3368. That being so, the high death-rate is attributable in one case to the mismanagement of the governing body, and the absence of the high death-rate in the other is obviously due to the good management of the governing body there!—*Nos septimus.*

3369. May I ask what means you have taken to attend to sanitary matters in your district?—Since the recent Public Health Act of 1878 came into operation, a Public Health Committee has been appointed. I have had the privilege of being appointed a member of that committee.

3370. Was there any Public Health Committee previously appointed in Rathmines?—I cannot say.

3371. But since the Act came into operation in August last, there has been a Public Health Committee?—Yes.

3372. Do you agree with the statement some of the gentlemen made here in giving us the staff that conduct the sanitary duties of the township. Who are they?—As to number!

3373. Number or name, whichever you wish!—There is our secretary, who acts as the sanitary officer; our inspector, who acts as the sub-sanitary officer.

3374. That is Mr. Johnston?—No, it is not; it is M'Evoy. And also another officer who has certain duties in the way of serving the summonses, and so forth.

3375. The summons-server is the hall-porter, who is also the fire brigade man!—I don't know; I don't think he is.

3376. These gentlemen have only been discharging

sanitary duties since 1878!—Only since a very recent period.

3368. And therefore as far as the Town Commissioners are concerned, the condition of the death-rate of the district was owing to none of their efforts!—Except so far as the appointment of those particular officers was concerned.

3369. Who discharged the duties previously—since 1846!—I cannot say. I had no control over them.

3370. I think I caught an observation from you that the district was a healthy one, as compared with the city!—No doubt of it.

3371. And the population are also in the upper ranks of society!—The comfortable class.

3372. You have not many tenement houses in Rathmines!—We have not.

3373. You are aware that there are a large number of such houses in the city!—I am aware there are.

3374. Are you aware they have 9,000 and odd in Dublin!—I am aware they have a great many.

3375. And that there is a large poor population there!—I am aware of that.

3376. Are you also aware that a good deal of the artisan class, who work in the township, reside in Dublin!—Yes.

3377. When in ill-health or sickness, are they not chargeable on the hospitals of Dublin!—I believe so.

3378. When they get ill they go to hospital in Dublin where they reside!—I cannot say; I presume they do, if they go to hospital at all. It is most likely.

3379. And when they fall in health they are relieved at the cost of the rates!—Yes, I suppose so.

3380. Did you ever hear complaints in Rathmines of the conduct of the business there!—I have.

3381. They conduct the business in private, and the ratepayers have not an opportunity of knowing how matters go on!—Yes;

3382. Were you aware of the transactions which led to the establishment of a public audit there!—Of the full details I am not aware.

3383. Were you aware that it was not there until a remonstrance was addressed, under the statute, to the Local Government Board regarding it!—I am not aware of that.

3384. Was there a memorial addressed, on the part of the statutory number of ratepayers, to the Local Government Board, requesting that a public audit should be established in Rathmines. Was there, or was there not!—I don't know.

3385. Was there a public audit granted!—There was.

3386. In Mr. Stokes's chairmanship!—Yes; during Mr. Stokes's chairmanship.

3387. And that has been in operation for two years!—I believe it has.

3388. Is the public water supply in Rathmines satisfactory to all parties!—I don't think so.

3389. Have you heard complaints about the condition of the roads!—I have.

3390. And about the sewerage!—Yes.

3391. That you are amending!—We have the amendment of the sewerage before us.

3392. May I ask you what defects have been alleged concerning the Dublin Corporation which prevents the due discharge of their duties!—Well, one defect that has been very strongly urged against the Dublin Corporation is, that it does not thoroughly well discharge its duties.

3393. In what respect!—With regard to the cleaning of the streets and the general sanitation of the city, with regard to its want of attention to the business which should claim attention—the business of the city—from their inability to form quorums on the occasions of public business requiring that they should be formed. That must be perfectly obvious to any person who has given attention to the records of the meetings of the Corporation during the last twenty years.

3394. May I ask you, as you have paid a good deal of attention to these matters, on how many occasions

during the last two years they have failed to form a quorum!—I cannot say how many times, but I know that complaints have been made again and again. Complaints have been made during the present majority of members having to wait a quarter of an hour and half an hour for a quorum to be formed.

3395. Are you aware that during the last three years the roll is always called within a quarter of an hour of the time for which the meeting is summoned?—I am aware of that from the reports in the newspapers, but yet I say that complaints are made.

3396. CHAIRMAN.—I believe the Corporation themselves want the quorum reduced!—I quite approve of that, and that is the only proper way of dealing with the case.

3397. Dr. Newwood.—With regard to sanitary matters, did you ever see the returns of the work discharged by the Corporation?—Only so far as their own documents that are published would show them, and the public papers which I have generally looked at.

3398. I am sure you are too fair a man to condemn persons unheard!—I am thoroughly under the belief that there is no city in Great Britain that has such an extended street area, and such an amount of work to be done in it as that governed by the Dublin Corporation, relative to population and taxable value.

3399. With regard to the cleansing of the streets, are you aware of the circumstances which surround that matter, and which have formed the subject of discussion here for many days!—When you ask me am I aware of any particular question, I must reply that I am not aware of any particular question. I only look at the result, and the common testimony which one reads in the papers regarding such matters when they come under discussion, and then I go by my own observation of the streets of Dublin when I pass through them. I happen to pass through certain of the back streets of Dublin rather frequently, and I know that they are not a very good contrast to the general public thoroughfares.

3400. You are also aware that those streets are inhabited by a very humble and a very poor class of persons!—I am.

3401. And that they inhabit tenement houses which, in many cases, do not provide proper drainage accommodation for the number of persons inhabiting them!—Yes.

3402. And that, therefore, there would be special difficulties in the way of keeping those streets clean!—Yes; I am aware of that.

3403. CHAIRMAN.—You said that on the basis proposed you would not think it right to have any amalgamation!—Not on equal taxation—that we should have to pay the same taxation as the citizens of Dublin.

3404. Would you think it right to add Rathmines to Dublin if there was a differential taxation, and, if so, what. The Corporation then say they would be prepared to reduce the number of the Corporation to 45 from 60, and to give the other 15 members—6 to Rathmines, 6 to Fingal, and the other 3 to Drumcondra and Kilmainham. Would you approve of a scheme of anything of that kind and with differential taxation!—The scheme of differential taxation would necessitate some objections which have to be met; but, at the same time, it would be filled with this inherent defect, that the fluctuating character of the members of the Corporation, and the absorption of time in merely political discussions and political matters, would interfere very largely with its competence to control the out districts which it took in, and I should expect myself to suffer by the change.

3405. When you speak of being brought in at all on a differential taxation, does that appear to indicate an opinion from you that the townships ought to contribute something towards Dublin. Is that your idea!—No, certainly not. I do not think that the Corporation or the city of Dublin has any natural or proper claim on the townships for a contribution to it.

DEBEN.
May 20, 1873.
Mr. Charles
Eason

DUBLIN,
May 20, 1879.
Mr. Charles
Knox.

3405. You said that the shopkeepers in Dublin, particularly the larger ones, derive large profits from the business they do with the Rathmines people coming into the city to do their shopping, and that that enabled them to pay the taxation of the city, and therefore if they are taxed in the city they are better able to pay it!—Certainly.

3407. What do you say to the large class who do not derive any profit from the people of Rathmines, who make use of the roads and increase the taxation of the town by the use of the roads and their scavenging. What do you say to the class who derive no profit whatsoever from all those people coming in?—But you must be aware, Mr. Chairman, that for a very long time there has been, as it were, a kind of exodus from the city of Dublin, and that a large proportion of persons who have had the means, and who have felt the attractions of living outside the city—of having convenience and better air in the outlying district—those attractions have inclined them to live there rather than in the city itself, and they know all about the disadvantages that attached to the city in consequence of its high death rate and the imperfect control which the city authorities preserve over the machinery and conditions of sanitation.

3408. That is one of the very things they go to the country for, to get pure air and cheaper taxation, because of there being no prosperity, and so they get an immense advantage in that way going out to the country; but if they make their money in the city and go there for their amusements, why should they not give something to help the citizens, who are not as fortunate as themselves, and who are not able to live in a dearer locality and with pure air?—But when they come to the city and purchase their goods from the citizens, they are, in that way, able to pay their taxes by the profits they derive on those goods.

3409. Though they go out and enjoy the pure air of the country, the cleaner the city is kept the more free from disease, the more the sanitary arrangements are attended to, and the scavenging is done, the better it is for their own health and that of their families who come to the city daily, and they come to the Town Hall to do their duties. Is not all that going on at the expense of the city, and those who live in it, and are not able to get out, and on whom the taxation presses so heavily, and that largely for the benefit of people who are not living in the city or contributing to its taxation?—Peri posse, the same truth would apply to London, where people live forty and fifty miles away from their place of business, and who ought to be followed with the same object you speak of.

3410. Is it not the case that they are followed, at all events, for a long distance?—Certainly not. Only so far as any business they do in the city of London carries with it a profit, which pays for the things you speak of.

3411. When there is an extension in London, are not the buildings captured instantly by the Metropolitan Board of Works, and which are made to pay their proportion of the sewerage. Is not that the case down as far as Knightsbridge, and miles off are they not paying for the enormous new sewer through that district?—You have drawn a fine line London in reference to the Main Drainage Board of the City of London, and outside that line a very large proportion of the very class you speak of live. That is a matter of fact.

3412. As London extends are they not taken in?—No, certainly not. They don't reach down to Kingston, for example.

3413. If I don't mistake, in the case of the Metropolitan Board of Works, their taxation extends 13 or 15 miles from Hyde Park Corner?—In which direction?

3414. Westward. They have gone on following up new extensions, and as they go on they provide sewers, and the moment they provide sewers they come

under the same taxation to pay the debts—the money that was borrowed for the purposes of main drainage!—But here you have a different state of things. We have created a different drainage—an independent one, which is going out by itself.

3415. But if you were annexed to Dublin they propose to pay their share of your debt. The proposal of the Corporation is this:—They say "We have a road roll which would give us £700,000 if sold off. You will find our debts to be £280,000, leaving only £120,000 clear. We will take your debts, and we will give you the benefit."

3416. Mr. Walker.—"Of all their debts!"

3417. CHAIRMAN.—"The benefit of our city estate." It may be said that that is altogether fallacious, and that they have no city estate at all; but when I hear it said "You want us to be annexed to beggary," I want to know do you ignore the city estate? Or would this be your idea, that each Board should bear its own debts, and then, that you would be brought into the City of Dublin on a differential taxation; or do you say you should run up as you are, and not contribute one farthing towards Dublin?—I say that until there is shown to be real competence on the part of the City of Dublin to administer its own affairs satisfactorily, and in such a way as to satisfy the people of the city here, and that they proposed to present themselves on a fair and equal position with the rulers of the suburbs, so to speak, in the matter of being equal with them, and perfectly as competent as we are to control their affairs—when they can produce such evidence as will satisfy the House of Commons that they will be able in the future to control the enlarged area which they propose to absorb, then in my opinion it will be time enough to do that; but until they can satisfy the House of Commons that they can, and do attend to the work, as well as the power and capacity to do so—until they can do that I don't think the House of Commons will sanction it.

3418. I don't know what the House of Commons may do, but the question is this: Suppose the Corporation of Dublin were as competent as your body in Rathmines—that you were just as satisfied with the 40 of the Corporation as you are with the 21 of Rathmines—that they were all first-rate men of business, who would not stand to anything but the business before them during the time of the meeting—would you then be for passing the township along with the Corporation?—You would remove a great deal of the objections by the fact of a proof of competence.

3419. You may assume that the Corporation have a very bad character?—I don't think that is an assumption at all.

3420. Mr. Heron.—Do you think it advisable that there should be five or six governing bodies in the city and townships?—It depends upon the extent of the area. I am disposed to think that the perfect manipulation and control of the sub-districts requires that there should be such sub-division. In regard to the details, as that they should be practically controlled by separate bodies. I don't care whether you call them separate corporations or separate committees of one corporation—it is a matter of indifference to me, but the principle lies.

3421. CHAIRMAN.—If you were sure that they would improve you would not have the same objection to join them?—Certainly not.

3422. In reference to the matter of expense, some one said something in reference to the expense of the management of the Corporation. Do you know that your own cost of management is, I believe, rather more in proportion than the Corporation of Dublin?—It is, I believe.

3423. I find that the cost of the management of the sanitary department is over £10,000 a year, and that on an income of £10,000 a year is too much. The Dublin cost is, I believe, £15,000 a year on an income of a quarter of a million, which is moderate, even with the superannuation given to the officers. Don't you think if the whole of the township districts were cap-

him, that instead of having to provide a town surveyor in each place, who would keep proper maps and proper sanitary officers in each place, that the one staff could do, including Milltown and all those places. Don't you think if the whole thing was thrown into one body, with a thoroughly competent engineer to superintend the entire, and to do nothing else, with a couple of good officials under him, paid good salaries—that proper sanitary officers were appointed to have the sanitary work carried out, and to have all the township main roads and lanes attended to by the police selected for that purpose by the Corporation—don't you think the thing would be better done?—I don't think it would. I don't think public virtue reaches to that constant succession of good men so as to obtain it.

3424. You appear to be under the impression that there was nothing to be done by such a body as yours until the Public Health Act of last year?—I don't think so. I went in under the impression that there were considerable changes needed.

3425. How long have you been a member?—Only a few months.

3426. Do you know whether your body contract or undertake the removal of house refuse from the different premises—the cleaning of earth closets, privies, and cesspools belonging to the premises?—Do you mean that under the statute we have certain special objects for which we are to undertake the work of other bodies previously in existence?

3427. Do your men go round every day with carts and cleanse the cesspools and privies, and have you any staff for that purpose?—No, because they are not required.

3428. If you don't undertake it yourself, have you made any bye-laws?—We have not passed bye-laws. We have applied to the Local Government Board for bye-laws which have received their sanction, and we are awaiting the action of the Local Government Board in order to perfect our own interior arrangements. There is another matter which I would like to mention with regard to the subjects which have come up here, and which I did not think were properly grappled with. I allude to notices of complaint concerning the roads which are occasionally made. It is very well known that for temporary periods there must be times, such as we have had during the past winter, when there is considerable difficulty in clearing away the accumulations of filth and dirt. In particular districts complaints have been made to the Commissioners, which we have had under consideration, and which we have again and again looked into; and I have myself gone over the portions of the township which have been complained of by a gentleman sitting in this room, Mr. Bentley, in regard to the matters in which he asked for the report of the secretary, and I say that there is a thorough attention given by the Commissioners to the complaints which are sent in from the townpeople. I feel, not only in reference to that, but also in reference to the water supply, that while the water supply is not adequate in regard to the pressure, relatively to the reasonable requirements of the inhabitants, I think they get at the present time a very good supply, and a very large portion of those complaints are due to wilful waste on the part of persons in the township, who allow their taps to run, and to all sorts of breaches of regulation, by which their pressure in the higher districts is affected.

3429. Mr. Cotton.—Are they ever prosecuted?—I

think not. I think it is a weakness on the part of the Commissioners in taking that lenient view of it, but that is the explanation of it.

3430. CHAIRMAN.—I understand from Mr. Murphy that there were no accumulations of filth?—Not for a continuance of time, but you must know that during the last frost, when the snow was lying about. There were some occasions when particular districts—lanes which we had taken up originally under our control, and which were complained of—could not be kept thoroughly clean but in others in which I saw the accumulations I saw that they were practically building materials which were being employed in the construction of walls and houses, and on the very lanes which Mr. Bentley owned.

3431. Is the water always on in the Bathmead township?—It is not. It is not always on in the city.

3432. Not in the city?—No; I have known it off.

3433. Is it regularly turned off at Bathmead?—It is in parts.

3434. For what purpose?—I cannot say. You will have our surveyor here, and he will be able to explain that to you.

3435. Is it turned off at night?—I believe it is in some districts.

3436. And is that done with the knowledge and sanction of the Town Commissioners?—Unquestionably.

3437. If it is turned off in that way, suppose there was a fire in those districts, who have you to look after the water—what would happen?—I suppose they would be a great deal better off than before there was any in the district at all.

3438. How long have the Commissioners sanctioned the water being turned off at night?—I cannot tell you.

3439. Surely the Town Surveyor could not do it without the sanction of the Commissioners. Is it turned off in consequence of a deficient supply?—It is turned off in order to the filling of certain portions of the upper areas which are not so well reached during the lower pressures. I think that question has not yet been mastered by the Commissioners.

3440. In whose discretion is it to turn it "off" or "on"?—That will be told you by the Surveyor.

3441. Have the Board authorized the Surveyor to turn it off from certain districts according as he wishes, or have they given him authority to do it only for certain hours?—It is merely during the filling of the reservoir.

3442. Is there a man appointed to look after it at all?—Certainly there is.

3443. Then, has he any directions on the subject?

Mr. Walker.—We cannot tell you what directions he has until we examine him.

3444. Certainly you can. The witness is one of the Commissioners.

Witness.—Certainly; but I have been a Commissioner only a few months. It is an intermittent service.

3445. I was under the impression it was a continuous supply.

3446. Dr. Newbold.—And up to the present hour we had no instructions to the contrary.

3447. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Bolton says he is perfectly satisfied with the supply, yet it is turned off in certain portions of the district during the night. If that be so, all I can say is that they must be very queer people to be satisfied with that sort of supply.

Dr. Robert Brown examined.

Dr. Robert Brown.

3448. Mr. Walker.—You are the Medical Officer of Health of the township?—Yes.

3449. When were you appointed?—In 1874 as Medical Officer of Health.

3450. You are pretty well acquainted with the health of the township?—I ought to know it pretty well.

3451. And are acquainted with its sanitary state?—Yes.

3452. The health of the township is, I believe, in a good condition?—Yes.

3453. Is the sanitation of the township in a good state?—It is in a very fair state.

DR. ROBERT BROWN.
May 10, 1889
Mr. Charles Eaton.

because I think it is a case of "turn about." They get the use of our roads.

3505. But we get the use of your bridges; what do you say to that?—I don't agree with it.

3506. Would you think it would be useful to have an efficient fire brigade in your district?—It would be very good to have the use of one.

3507. But not to pay for it?—I don't mean that I mean not to have it altogether on the township rate.

3508. Not to have to support one by yourselves?—Yes.

3509. Dr. Norwood.—Are you in favour of a joint one?—I mean a contributory one.

3510. We are agreed as to the bridges, we are agreed as to the fire brigade, we are very nearly agreed as to the roads—and now with regard to the police? I believe you have in the township the very same system of police as in the city?—Yes.

3511. You are in the same Poor Law district?—Yes.

3512. CHAIRMAN.—Why should you pay the same for the police as Dublin?—Because we have the full benefit of them.

3513. No; because you don't want half the number in proportion to your area that Dublin does. You have a well-conducted and peaceable population, and you don't want them. It is because there is such a number of bad characters in town that the city requires such a large number of police; yet you are made to pay, not for your own police, but you are made to pay for the Dublin police just as well. Do you think that right?—We pay our proportion.

3514. You pay your proportion for the police over the whole area. If you paid for only what you wanted for yourselves, your police tax would not be £d. in the pound?—We could not get what you allude to.

3515. The law makes you pay. While you would require say 10 police for the area of Rathmines, you would want 100 for the same area in Dublin; and were you to pay in an equal proportion with a Dublin man for the police, you should only pay for 10, and yet you have to pay for 100. Do you think that right?—That is a thing that cannot be helped.

3516. Dr. Norwood.—Do you know Rathmines well?—I do.

MR. ALFRED HENSHAW examined.

3517. Mr. Walker.—I believe you are one of the Commissioners of the Rathmines Township?—I am.

3518. Have you property in Rathmines?—Yes.

3519. What income do you derive out of it?—about?—Between £600 and £700.

3520. What expenditure have you made in Rathmines?—about?—Between £10,000 and £11,000.

3521. Have you property in the Pembroke Township?—Yes, I have.

3522. What expenditure have you made in that township?—Something over £3,000.

3523. Have you considerable property also in Dublin?—Yes.

3524. At what income are you taxable there?—Well I don't know exactly what I pay in taxes in the city.

3525. What rental do you derive out of it?—about?—The total valuation of the property I own in the city, is something over £700 a year. Then about rather more than one half is in my own occupation for business purposes.

3526. Therefore, you pay a considerable amount in taxes in the city as well?—Yes, I do.

3527. Then it is not much difference to you as regards taxation whether there is annexation or not?—Quite so.

3528. Are you acquainted with the way in which the township affairs are managed in Rathmines?—Yes. I know a little about them.

3529. Was this expenditure of yours made in those townships on the faith of them being under separate bodies?—It was in my calculation when I laid out the money, and a very important point too.

3530. Have you any hospitals in Rathmines?—No.

3531. Where do the people of Rathmines go when they get sick?—Well as a rule people don't go to hospital, when they get sick. There are members who go down to the County Infirmary—Mount Hospital, 3319. And where is the County Infirmary?—In Camden-row.

3532. What becomes of the countless thousands who build the fine houses in Rathmines, and sleep in the city every night—where do they go when they get sick? They go to the city. I suppose very few of them would go to an hospital at all.

3533. Where do they go?—They stop at home.

3534. CHAIRMAN.—Even if they have contagious disease?—It is impossible to get some of them to go to hospital.

3535. Do you mean in Rathmines?—No, I am not tying myself to Rathmines.

3536. Are there any such in Rathmines?—I could not tell. I know the majority of the working classes won't go to hospital.

3537. Mr. Norwood.—Have you ever heard any complaints about the water supply in Rathmines?—No, except in the higher districts where it was joined on to Rathgar. Want of pressure—that is the only thing.

3538. Were you here in the early part of the day?—I was.

3539. Did you hear Mr. Hassard's evidence?—I came just late for that.

3540. Are you aware that you pay more taxes than they do in Dublin?—I was rather surprised to hear that.

3541. CHAIRMAN.—Would you like to see the streets of Dublin better kept?—Yes.

3542. And better scavenged?—Yes.

3543. Is it because you come in and use them that you say it would be of advantage to see them better kept?—I don't look upon it on selfish grounds at all.

3544. But for the comfort of the people?—Yes. You asked me some question about scavenging, just now. I may tell you that I am constantly on the roads of our township, and I never knew of any neglect to take place.

3545. Are the small streets well attended to?—Yes, and the stable lanes and all.

DEBATES.

JULY 29, 1874.

Mr. WILSON.

Mrs. MOLLEN.

Mr. Alfred Henshaw.

3546. Are you satisfied, being a long time there, with the state of the roads and the pathways, with the supply of gas and water, and the general management of the affairs?—Yes, I am.

3547. Are you aware of the feeling of the people in the township as regards this question of annexation?—As far as I can form an opinion from the number I have met with, they are decidedly against annexation. I scarcely know one that I have spoken to on the subject who expressed an opposite opinion.

3548. CHAIRMAN.—Is that because they would have to pay increased taxation?—That is the principal reason, no doubt.

3549. Mr. Walker.—And as regards these matters of the roads, drainage, and other matters, in your opinion does the state of the township contract favourably with Dublin?—Yes, I think it does.

3550. Have you expended much money in Dublin upon your business premises?—Yes.

3551. You have some premises in Christ Church-place?—Yes.

3552. What was the valuation of them before you made the expenditure?—The valuation was about £130 a year.

3553. What was the result of your expenditure?—The valuation was increased to £210, or double the former valuation.

3554. From that and other circumstances is it your opinion that there should be a revaluation of the city?—I believe there should.

3555. It has the effect of damping enterprise?—Well, I think the valuation is unequal and unfair.

DUBLIN.
May 24, 1870
Mr Alfred
Hawthorne.

3557. The township valuation is something higher?—The buildings being new, the valuation is higher.

3558. Do the Commissioners discharge their business—all the business they have in hand—every day of their meeting?—Yes, I believe so.

3559. Is there any hard and fast line about separating at ten?—Certainly not.

3560. You go through all the business on the paper?—Yes, and most of mine punctually.

3561. Mr. Heron.—As a rule, do you separate at ten o'clock?—No; we very seldom separate at that hour.

3562. Do you ever put down in the minutes what hour you adjourn?—I cannot say. I don't think that is done, but my impression is that it is generally from about half-past ten to eleven o'clock.

3563. But you are generally in town yourself, I presume, before eleven o'clock?—I am generally in town before that hour.

3564. Do you consider that a district like Dublin and the suburbs should have five or six different governing bodies to look after its drainage and sewerage?—I think it would be very desirable to have the sewerage under one body; but we were not able to get that carried out. In our township we are to have a system of our own.

3565. And in the same way don't you think the roads should be under one body?—No, I do not.

3566. You think they should be under separate bodies?—I think so.

3567. You know that the population of the city of Dublin has slightly declined?—Well, I have seen it so stated.

3568. Does not that arise from the numbers who could afford it going to live in the townships?—Well, I dare say that would be one reason.

3569. And in that way escape city taxation?—Well, I think if the city was re-valued, the Corporation would have sufficient money; I don't think they have enough now. If the city was re-valued, the Corporation would not be pressed for money.

3570. Don't you think that it would be better that the affairs of Dublin, as far as the real city of Dublin extends, should be under the management of one

body?—What do you mean by the real city of Dublin?—do you mean the present boundary?

3571. No. I mean if Rathmines is annexed by reason of their being the original city of Dublin, and the Dublin people going out to live in Rathmines; therefore we, to a certain extent, say that Rathmines is part of Dublin, and inhabited by Dublin people?—Partly so; but a great many people come up from the country to reside in Rathmines.

3572. Every one of your Commissioners is a Dublin man, having business in Dublin?—Yes; either now or at some former time.

3573. Therefore, they are altogether Dublin men?—Yes.

3574. And in that sense I call Rathmines part of Dublin?—Well, I don't.

3575. Do you call yourself a Dublin man?—Well, yes.

3576. Would you think it advisable for Rathmines to annex Dublin?—No; we don't want that.

3577. Would you think it advisable, as one of the governing body, for Rathmines to annex Dublin?—Oh, no.

3578. It is so well managed?—I am not praising the management of Rathmines particularly.

3579. I put it to you as a man of business, don't you think it advisable that there should be one management instead of six managements?—I don't at all think so.

3580. Is it not a singular thing that a number of respectable gentlemen should come forward and be found saying that Dublin is sickly and unhealthy, and saying everything they possibly can against their own city?—I have not said so. They may speak from their own experience; but I don't at all think so.

3581. CHAIRMAN.—As a Commissioner are you aware that the water is turned off in the township for a portion of the night?—I believe it is turned off for an hour or two while they are filling the tank to supply the upper portion of the district.

3582. Is there any arrangement about it?—It is understood by the Board that it is done.

3583. Is there anyone told off to see that it is done?—Yes; our Surveyor sees after it.

3584. I don't suppose that the surveyor goes himself and turns it off?—No; but there is a competent man.

MR. JAMES T. HARBOURS EXAMINED.

Mr. James T.
Habour.

3585. Mr. Address.—You reside in Rathmines?—Yes, in the Rathmines district, in Upper Leeson street.

3586. And you are an owner of property there?—I am.

3587. I believe you have been resident there for either thirteen or fourteen years?—Upwards of fourteen years.

3588. Within your recollection has there been much improvement in that township?—It seems to me that there is. I have observed considerable improvement in the township.

3589. Have you yourself laid out a considerable sum of money there?—To me it is. I have laid out about £4,000.

3590. Is that in house property?—Yes; some purchasing and some building.

3591. Would you have done so if you were aware that there was any probability of the township being annexed to the Corporation?—I would not.

3592. Then, in your judgment, it would be better that Rathmines should remain a district township?—As far as I can judge, I think it would.

3593. In the management of the township affairs by the Commissioners satisfactory?—I have not heard any complaints, with the exception of some little matters that I thought were got up for election purposes, such as the complaints about the water, wanting to introduce the Vestry. Within the last couple of years I have heard that

3594. Is the condition of the roads and thoroughfares satisfactory to you?—Yes.

3595. Do you think the management of Dublin is superior, and would it be desirable to be annexed to it?—Well, I cannot say that I have that opinion at all. I have some house property in the city—not very much, and not of a very good class. I heard since I attended the inquiry a good deal of talk about tenement houses. Well, I have share of them for ever, subject to a nominal rent, and the police never have a conviction in these houses from the way I have kept them. I have kept them as model houses. I consider that if the houses of the same class in the city were kept in the same way, there would be a great deal less of expense in the way of taxation: because, I think a little more supervision by the police, and the carrying out of those measures of making the owners of property provide for their tenants' accommodation properly, would improve matters much. I have done everything in the way of drainage and cleansing, and providing ash-pits; and if a tenant left a room it would be immediately prepared and painted, and in some of these houses I have tenants for upwards of twenty years, mainly paying a certain amount per week.

3596. I suppose the superior management of your houses causes a superior sanitary condition of the inhabitants?—I think so. I don't think the houses of the same class in any locality are kept in the same

DESIGN.
May 21, 1879.
Mr. James T
Harrick.

3607. Mr. Heron.—Where are the houses?—Two of these houses are in Castle-street, and one is in South Cumberland-street.

Cross-examined by Dr. Newood.

3608. Are you aware that the police have had the supervision of your premises?—Yes, and they said that to my caretaker.

3609. Are you aware that they have made similar efforts in the case of houses in your immediate neighbourhood, to ensure, if possible, a like sanitary condition?—The result has not been the same.

3610. Everyone is not as reasonable as you; but are you aware that the police have been doing a great deal in that direction?—Yes. I know that if I hadn't done so I would have been called upon, and I think if the same supervision had been exercised in other instances it would have had the same result; but I did it willingly.

3611. But you are not aware that the same supervision has not been exercised in other cases?—I am not. I certainly have met with a great deal of petition and civility from Mr. Boyle on one or two occasions.

3612. You are aware that Mr. Boyle has been endeavouring, as far as possible, to insure a like sanitary condition in other places?—I think him a most active officer, and inclined to do, in his way, everything that is in his power.

3613. And, as far as that department is concerned, you have nothing to say against the Corporation?—I only say the result has not succeeded. I only say that whenever I have complained to Mr. Boyle he has done everything in his power to remedy the evil complained of.

3614. CHAIRMAN.—I think you said you would not have expended your money in the township if you thought you were ever to be annexed to the Dublin Corporation?—I will qualify that in this way—it was on account of the expensive taxation.

3605. And what is the reason of that answer?—I consider that in buildings there are vested rights. Of course it was for light taxation that I went to the township in laying out of the little earnings of my life.

3606. Dr. Newood.—You knew the taxation at that time, when you laid it out, that it was £2, and that the want of an extra £1 in the pound prevented your getting a better water supply and a fire brigade?—I considered that we had a good supply of water, in every way very satisfactory, and excellent good voice. I have had the use of it for these number of years that I have lived in the township, and I consider that it has been wholesome and agreeable in every way. It has only one drawback, that it is a little hard.

3607. It is stated by your own people in Rathmines that the pressure is not good enough?—Part of the houses I have are on the rise in Palmerston-road, and there is abundant pressure there, and I have never felt any want.

3608. The rate is 2s. now, if at the time you built your houses the rate was 3s. what difference on each of your houses would that comprehend?—I only built one house. I would not look at it according to the yield of profit.

3609. The additional £1 in the pound would be only £10 in the year?—I didn't ever think of it in that way. I made my purchase as I thought advantageous.

3610. Your answer would seem to go to show that if you thought there would have been any increase in the taxation, you would not have built there. I can understand if you thought there would be an increase of £1, or 6s. in the pound; but I was asking you would an increase of £1 in the pound have stopped you?—One shilling in the pound is a good deal.

3611. It would have been £10 on you?—I am not saying it would have prevented me.

The inquiry was adjourned until next morning.

DUBLIN—NINTH DAY—MAY 21st, 1879.

May 21, 1879.

Mr. HENRY JOHNSTON examined.

Mr. Henry
Johnston.

3612. Mr. Andrews.—Mr. Johnston, you are the engineer to the Rathmines Commissioners?—I am.

3613. And you have been for a great many years?—Since 1847.

3614. Will you give the Commissioners the mileage of roads in the township?—Very nearly twenty-two miles.

3615. You are able to speak from personal observation, and, therefore, I ask you how are these roads kept?—They are in very good order and condition.

3616. Can you give the Commissioners in round figures what the cost of these roads must have been?—The entire cost of repairs, scavenging, and watering is about £150 per mile per annum.

3617. With regard to the construction of them, what would be a low figure to estimate their cost at?—Do you mean of the construction of the roads?

3618. Yes; such of the roads as have been constructed since 1842?—I could not say that exactly; there have been a large number constructed since 1847.

3619. Are the pathways in a satisfactory condition also?—They are. The pathway on one side of each road has been coated with tar pavement; they will all be done in time.

3620. Have you for the purpose of maintaining, repairing, and scavenging the roads a sufficient staff?—Quite sufficient.

3621. You find you don't require any more?—We don't require any more.

3622. Can you give me in one figure what is the cost of the maintenance of the roads per annum?—Nearly £3,000 altogether.

3623. About £3,000?—Yes; sometimes over and sometimes less, about that.

3624. That is including scavenging?—Everything; water and all.

3625. With reference to the sewers, you have main sewers, of course, independently of the new sewers made under the recent Act?—Yes.

3626. And do you see that new houses are connected with them?—Yes; everyone, and we don't allow anyone to touch the main sewer but our own men.

3627. That all connections must be made by your own officers?—Yes; the applicant is required to lodge money, and then the work is done, and they get the balance if there is any left.

3628. I used hardly ask you is that work done properly?—In every case.

3629. Have you a map in your office showing the sewers?—Yes; I brought it here this morning.

3630. Is it capable of being inspected by everyone?—Yes; everyone who likes, and I have another one about four years. I have this new one here (produces map).

3631. Is there any means of obtaining the information that builders desire as to sewerage in your office?—Yes; everyone gets information; my instructions from the Commissioners, and my own inclination is to give everyone's information.

3632. Have you an abundant water supply?—We have.

3633. With reference to what was said yesterday as to the turning of it off, explain to the Commissioners to what extent it is turned off?—The water works were designed to supply Rathmines township only. That is as far as the Redgur Chapel on the Redgur-road, and afterwards the township of Redgur was added, and it was found that the works at Galanstown were not sufficiently high to send it to all

U

DODDIE
May 25, 1878.
Mr. Henry
Johnstone.

the township, and, in order to supply Rathgar, a tank was erected which is higher than any of the houses in the highest level in Rathgar.

3634. Rathgar is the highest level!—Yes.

3635. And you took care to erect a tank that would supply the houses on the highest level!—Yes; it is about sixty feet over it.

3636. The object in turning off the water was that an immense quantity had run to waste at night from twelve to six, probably 50,000 gallons, and the Commissioners gave me instructions to have it shut off in order to save that water at night. It is pumped into the tank.

3637. In fact on your finding it desirable to increase your water supply, you have the means of doing so from the Dodder!—I have already prepared a plan going thirty feet higher on the canal, but I don't know much about the Dodder scheme.

3638. You have heard of Mr. Hassell's plan!—Yes.

3639. We have heard that the canal water is not so soft as the Vartry, and there is no doubt about it!—No doubt.

3640. Is it pure and well filtered!—It is well filtered. I take care of that.

3641. Mr. Heron.—What is the size of the tank that supplies Rathgar!—Sixty-two feet.

3642. How many thousand gallons does it hold!—102,000 gallons.

3643. And what is the real supply of Rathgar!—About one-third more than that.

3644. That would be 136,000 gallons!—Yes, about that.

3645. Then is Rathgar supplied at night also!—Pardon of it only. The tank that supplies Rathgar is filled from a nine-inch main, which comes from Hazel's-cross-bridge up to the tank.

3646. Do you fill it every night!—Yes; every night.

3647. Is there a man to see that it is filled!—There is a man working all night, an engineer pumping.

3648. How is it pumped!—With a steam engine.

3649. And what is the power of the engine!—There are two engines six-horse nominal, but they work at more.

3650. Mr. Corcoran.—Two six-horse engines!—Yes; one would do, but we keep two going to ease the engine.

3651. How many hours do they work!—About fifteen.

3652. Mr. Heron.—What is the cost of working them!—About £300 a year altogether, that is coals and everything.

3653. For how many hours is Rathgar shut off from water!—From between nine and ten o'clock at night until six in the morning.

3654. And for how many hours is Rathgar shut off from water!—None at all.

3655. Is there always plenty of water!—It is never shut off in Rathgar at night, only as far as Rathgar chokes.

3656. It is never shut off from any part of Rathgar!—No; always on.

3657. Have they a full supply at night!—It is never off.

3658. How do the Rathgar people waste 50,000 gallons at night!—I never could discover it, and I don't know how they do unless they leave it running at night.

3659. Do you think it a good arrangement to shut off the water from nine to six!—No; and I opposed it as much as I could.

3660. Why is it not a good arrangement!—Because in case of a fire it would take half an hour to turn it on.

3661. I am afraid it would take more!—No; it would take about half an hour.

3662. Is not it very deficient as regards sanitary arrangements not to have water through the night!—That is the way they run the water off at night.

3663. Are they not to have water on during the night!—No; I take it off; for our sewers don't require

it. There is a very high level, a stream always running through them to the Swan River.

3664. However, Rathgar is supplied all night with the water!—Yes.

3665. You exercise no control over the sewers running from the rows of yards and gardeons!—I never interfere with them except they are running into the main road.

3666. Sure it is most important to clear out these back places!—If there is anything wrong about the sewers in the back there is a sanitary inspector.

3667. I am instructed there are at present sewers at the back of the houses fronting Rathgar-road, at Garville-avenue, that drain into the back, and not into the front!—It is only from time to time as I discover these sewers that they can be set right.

3668. CHAIRMAN.—But these things should have been looked after longer ago. The Clauses Act of 1847 is incorporated in your Act!—Yes.

3669. And you are bound under the Act of '66 as well as '47 to have a map showing all the sewers in existence, and, as any new one was made, it should have been instantly put on the map!—So it will be for the future.

3670. CHAIRMAN.—It should have been done long ago!—It could not be done, for the drains were not known.

3671. Do you know these houses at the rear of Garville-avenue on Leicester-road!—Yes.

3672. Is there any drain there a sewer now!—I have never heard of any complaints about it.

3673. Mr. Heron.—Have you any means of testing the gas you supply to the township!—I have nothing whatever to do with that.

3674. Does any officer of the township test the gas!—Not that I am aware of.

3675. Have you any means of testing the gas!—No.

3676. When you say that the mileage of the sewers is nearly the same as the mileage of the roads, is that merely by estimation!—Except the lanes, some of which have no sewer, almost every road in the township has been covered.

3677. Have you any map showing the dates when the different sewers were built or extended!—No, our account book gives the date at which the sewers were made.

3678. And the amount of the work!—Yes.

3679. Does it always describe the place where the work was done!—Yes.

3680. Have you anything to say to the fire brigade!—No.

3681. I think you were mentioned as a man perfectly competent to train the men as a fire brigade!—I tell the man in charge of the engine if a fire occurs in the neighbourhood to come up and rap at my door, and if I can I go and give every assistance, but I am not bound to go.

3682. But you were mentioned as one of the officers who discharged the duties of an amateur fire brigade!—No.

3683. CHAIRMAN.—I understood Mr. Evans to say that you were the person who made all the arrangements and saw that the hose was kept ready from time to time and that all the appliances were in order and that the men were occasionally inspected by you.

3684. Mr. Heron.—In fact that you were in the same position as Captain Ingles in Dublin!—I am not. I go to give a hand and see if I can be of any assistance, but I am not bound to do so.

3685. Suppose a fire occurred at Rathgar at one o'clock at night, what would be the result!—I am afraid it would be a bad job until we turned the water on again.

3686. How far is the tank from the furthest part of the township!—It is just on the edge of the townships.

3687. Is there a man all night on duty at the tank!—There is a man all night on duty at the engine.

3688. What man is that!—The stoker, or engineer.

DODGE
Aug 25, 1870
Mr Henry Johnson.

3689. I suppose he has a pound a week altogether?—About that.

3690. And he is up all night?—Yes, he sleeps by day.

3691. Mr. CORROZ.—Have you two men?—Yes, one by day and the other by night.

3692. Mr. HERON.—How far is the pumping engine from the tank?—Less than a quarter of a mile.

3693. Is there anyone at the tank at night?—There is no cause for anyone.

3694. Mr. CORROZ.—Where is the tank?—At the back of Rathgar.

3695. What is the total lift of water?—A little over fifty feet.

3696. Mr. HERON.—Every night at nine o'clock does one of those wipers come and out off the water?—No, but the branches on the tanks are turned off.

3697. And while the water is running into the tank it is not running into the township?—Not the principal portion of Rathgar.

3698. You shut off no water from Rathgar?—No; it is always on there.

3699. You have no telegraphic communication?—None whatever.

3700. None at all through the township?—None whatever, except what is on the railways going out there.

3701. How many men have you under your control?—I have about twenty-three labourers now, and men to drive the horses—we have eight horses.

3702. Do you water at all with the hose?—No; entirely with carts.

3703. Entirely with carts?—We tried the hose and it would not do, it splashed people about, and put too much water on one part, and none at all on the other. We find the carts a great deal better.

3704. Have you any cesspools in Rathgar?—Not that I am aware of.

3705. Have you any in Rathgar?—I never heard of one.

3706. Did you ever inspect for cesspools?—I would not like to go into a gentleman's garden and dig up looking for cesspools, but I don't think there is one; I would have heard of it in thirty years.

3707. Have you any means of knowing whether every house is connected with the main sewer?—I am sure nearly every house is.

3708. With some sewer?—With the main sewer on the road.

3709. Is that because you would consider you would have heard complaints?—I think I would have heard something about it.

3710. Whose business is it to inspect to see there is no nuisance?—There is a man for that purpose.

3711. Is this the policeman?—I think he is.

3712. Do you know him?—Oh, yes.

3713. Does he ever report to you?—He reports to the office, and I leave a set of men, and a cart and horse at his disposal.

3714. You don't interfere with the inspection of nuisances?—I do; if I saw anything I did not like I would soon report it.

3715. But you don't go about reporting nuisances?—No.

3716. Have you ever prosecuted anyone?—There have been prosecutions.

3717. Have you ever prosecuted for nuisances?—No, but I think the secretary as the inspector has prosecuted.

3718. Have you any recollection of any prosecutions within the last ten years?—I have heard of them, but I don't know of them.

3719. You never interfere with that at all?—No.

3720. You confine yourself solely to the roads?—The roads and sewers, and pathways, and things of that kind.

3721. Are the pathways to Kenilworth-road in perfect order?—There is a good portion of them asphalted with tar pavement.

3722. Are they in perfect order?—Yes.

3723. Are the rest of them in good order?—I think they are in good order; we are doing a good deal of asphalt, and we will do a good deal of it this season at a cheap rate.

3724. What is the cheap rate?—When we began first, they charged 18d. a yard, and now we are doing it at 8d., by our own men.

3725. Is that laid on the south side of Kenilworth-road?—It is laid on the side next the chapel.

3726. About how much do you spend in asphalting in the township?—About £300 a year.

3727. Have you made any paved crossings?—Not this summer, but we will make a good many.

3728. Do you approve of them?—In some places I do, and others not.

3729. Do you think the gravel good?—No; I think good paved crossings are very good, going from one road to another; but some suppose where there is a heavy traffic on a road road, the crossings cut away a good deal on the sides; still they are serviceable.

3730. Still they are serviceable?—Yes, and there will be a good deal of them laid this year.

3731. Mr. CORROZ.—What was the cost of an ordinary paved crossing?—About 12s.

3732. Mr. ANDREWS.—Is that for the whole crossing?—No; 12s. per yard super.

3733. Mr. HERON.—Have you heard any complaints about there not being better pavements for crossing?—Yes; I have heard many complaints about crossing.

3734. And one of pavement?—No, not one of pavement; there is very little pavement in the township, except the tramways.

3735. Very little?—Yes; except odd crossings here and there.

3736. In wet weather are not the highways a little muddy?—No, they are gravelled.

3737. How many miles of asphalt have you in the township?—I think there might perhaps be eight miles, as near as I could go.

3738. Eight miles of highways?—Yes.

3739. Of course you have no asphalt on the main roads at all?—No.

3740. Is there any asphalt on the east side of Kenilworth-square?—There is, on the west side, on the north, and on the left-hand side, going up from the chapel.

3741. Why not on the east?—Because it will get it in its turn. My order was to do one part, and then go there again.

3742. Are the houses on the east of a higher class than the other?—I think they are all about the same, some better than others.

3743. Mr. CORROZ.—What is the cost of the pavement?—About 7d. or 8d., according to the price of material, in place of 1s. 6d. as before.

3744. Mr. HERON.—They will all get their turn in time at the rate of £300 a year?—Yes.

3745. That appears to be a little moderate—£300 a year?—We do a good deal with that on account of our doing it at a cheap rate ourselves. We are doing it at that low price, as we buy the materials, and employ men to put it on.

3746. You are doing it at a cheaper rate than anyone in the United Kingdom?—I don't know what other people pay, for it is very cheap considering what we paid before for it, now we are doing it ourselves.

3747. Do you boil it?—No; we mix it, and bring it down hot to the work; we have a place for doing that.

3748. It is about the cheapest job in the United Kingdom?—I don't know what other people pay, for it is very cheap considering what we paid before for it, now we are doing it ourselves.

3749. When did you begin to do it yourselves?—About four years ago.

3750. Have you had to take up any of the work that was done before?—Never; not a bit.

3751. CHAIRMAN.—What is your salary as surveyor?—£300 a year.

3752. Have there been many houses built in Rath-

BIRMINGHAM,
May 21, 1872.
Mr. Harry
Johnson.

miles from the middle of 1876 to the end of 1878!—
Oh, yes; they are always building somewhere.

3753. You say that the houses that are being built have connections made by you for their drains into the main drains!—Yes.

3754. Then they charge the people the cost!—Yes.

3755. Mr. Heron.—The work is done there, I suppose, by some of the twenty-two!—Yes; we have now specially for the purpose.

3756. You get the cost, but look at these two accounts, which are the only ones that have been audited, and show me a farthing in them for getting drains!—I do not know much about the accounts.

3757. CHAIRMAN.—Here are the items of the accounts (read accounts)—I think the money that is lodged for that work goes into the labour book.

3758. Mr. Heron.—This is the account received for sewer openings, namely, £31, but it does not show the connections.

3759. CHAIRMAN.—But it is not for openings and connections.

3760. Mr. Heron.—The owners provide the pipes, and we only do the laying.

3761. How many drains were connected in that year?—I could not say exactly.

Examination of Mr. JOHNSTON resumed.

3762. CHAIRMAN.—Can you say there has been no house built within 100 feet of the road where there has not been a drain made to the main sewer!—Not one.

3763. About this matter of the roads—in 1877 you expended altogether upon the roads £3,573 16s. 2d., and you get a contribution of £103 8s. 11d., as appears by your printed account, which leaves the balance £3,410 7s. 3d. expended by you. At that time, in 1877, £387 would represent a penny in the pound on your valuation, which shows an expenditure of nearly 10d. in the pound on the roads!

Mr. Heron.—There was 1d. spent on the roads in 1877.

3764. CHAIRMAN.—According to that it would be more, but in the next year you had only 7½d.!

Mr. Heron.—Because our valuation went so much higher.

3765. CHAIRMAN.—Then at the higher valuation it would have been 10d.!

Mr. Heron.—We could not have spent 10d. on the roads if we hadn't it to spend.

3766. CHAIRMAN.—The contribution for sewer opening was £39!

Mr. Heron.—That is labour.

3767. CHAIRMAN.—It is not labour on the roads!

Mr. Heron.—It is so, all other items are contributions for doing work.

3768. CHAIRMAN.—How many miles of sewers are there in Birminghams not marked on the map up to the present?

Mr. Heron.—I don't know of any. I think they are all marked down.

Examination of Mr. JOHNSTON resumed.

3769. Mr. Heron.—All your private sewers are not marked down!—No, but all the public drains are marked, and according as I discover the depths, and where they are, and all the private contracts, I put that down.

3770. Is not it quite plain that there are a great many private drains not laid down on the map!—Not on the public roads.

3771. CHAIRMAN.—Even in the smaller streets are they marked!—Yes.

3772. Every sewer, in fact!—We are more particular about small ones than the others.

3773. Mr. Heron.—When was Grosvenor-square built!—The one on the Leinster-road was built a good many years ago.

3774. You saw all the houses connected with sewers!—It was private ground, and I had no right to go near them. Just the same as if a gentleman built a house

on his lawn, I would have no right to go there to see whether it was covered.

3775. Is there a sewer there!—There is a sewer that drains them.

3776. Did you see it connected!—No; I did not. There was an architect employed, and he should see after that.

3777. But you say you have no notion of it!—No, because the drains go through private grounds.

3778. As far as I see, there is no sewer in the district!—No; it is not marked here, because it is portion of the great main drainage scheme.

3779. I suppose you have 20 miles not marked!—No; I have not.

3780. Grosvenor-square is not marked!—No; because it goes through private land. There is no sewer in the square.

3781. Where do they drain into!—They go down through the manory ground.

3782. Show me the sewer on the map!—There is no sewer; but when it is made, which I expect very soon, it will be on the map.

3783. In whose charge is the square, proprietors' and not Commissioners'?—No. That is the reason why we have nothing to do with it.

3784. Do the Commissioners repair the roads!—They do not.

3785. From where to where do they repair them!—They don't go in on the square at all.

3786. Where any private persons make any square you don't repair the roads or look after the sewerage!—Not until they give up the roads to the Commissioners.

3787. Mr. Cotton.—Have the Commissioners no sanitary control over houses not on the public roads!—Of course they have.

3788. Mr. Heron.—There are several properties situated like Grosvenor-square!—I don't know of any.

3789. CHAIRMAN.—As far as you know has there been any inspection by the Commissioners to see whether the houses in Grosvenor-square are connected with any sewer, or whether they drain into the cess-pools!—I know that they don't drain into cess-pools, and I know they are all connected, because I know some of the gentlemen who live in the square.

3790. Have the Commissioners of Institutions taken care that there has been an inspection and a report of these houses by any officer, I don't care who he is, to see whether every house in that square is properly drained!—The Inspector of nuisances could answer that better than I could.

3791. Mr. Heron.—Are houses built along the main line!—Yes, along Leinster-road.

3792. CHAIRMAN.—I am not saying at all it is your business, but the day before we were told you were the gentleman who would be able to give us information about it.

3793. Mr. Heron.—You say that Keallworth-square has a main sewer!—It has.

3794. Does it run right under the house!—No; in the front garden, inside the railings.

3795. What is the meaning of the dotted line!—That is where it goes through private ground.

3796. Then, as regards these houses, the sewage is collected at the back, and passes through the drains underneath the kitchens!—No; in front.

3797. But the water from the rear of the house, where does it get into the sewer!—It all goes into the sewer which runs partly under the house.

3798. Do you approve of that!—The landlord made it, of course, and I could not prevent it.

3799. CHAIRMAN.—When were these built!—I suppose about 12 years ago.

3800. Then they were built after the Act of '47, and they could not attempt to build one single house without having your approval of its plan!—This was an open stream, and it was covered in.

3801. Mr. Heron.—When did you put these sewers first on any public map!—About four years ago.

Dissent.
May 22, 1878
Mr. Henry
Johnston.

3802. And the mains along Rathgar-road!—About four years ago.

3803. How did you find them out?—If I had no map at all, I would know every sewer in the township.

3804. But these places between Grosvenor-square and Kentworth-square were not put down on the map from time to time as they were made!—No; they were put on the other map; according as we made a sewer we put it down, with the depth and everything else.

3805. There is a great district apparently without a sewer running down by the manerry, and there is Sandford-road, which is without sewage!—It is private property.

3806. Is Sandford-road under your jurisdiction?—Yes; the road is.

3807. There is no sewage there!—No; because it is all laid.

3808. But are not these houses marked on the map?—Yes; they are far from the drain, and there is a main drain runs along the boundary, and they drain into it.

3809. Mr. Heron.—Portobello Barracks is in your township—has it any drainage?—Yes.

3810. Where?—I don't know where, but they have it inside, and it comes out on the road.

3811. CHAIRMAN.—Hilton Lodge and these other places, where do they drain into—if they drain into cesspools, have the town Commissioners seen after that?—I don't know.

3812. Has any officer seen into this on behalf of the Commissioners?—The Inspector, I suppose.

3813. CHAIRMAN.—Are you able to say of your own knowledge that these houses are drained into the main sewer?—Some of them are.

3814. Mr. Heron.—Near Clancassell Bridge there is a very populous district, and there must be some sewage coming from these houses!—I don't know whether there are or not.

3815. In fact you don't know anything about it?—I don't know much about that place.

3816. From Leinster-road to the Grand Canal—a very considerable tract of country—you have no sewers laid down at all, except one to Harold's Cross road?—All these houses drain into it, I know.

3817. There is a drain from Grosvenor-square?—There is.

3818. Where does it go?—It goes down to the Harold's Cross-road sewer.

3819. Why is it not on the map?—Because there is going to be a larger one with these sewers.

3820. CHAIRMAN.—How long are they built?—About fifteen years.

3821. And why weren't they put on the map fifteen years ago?—We had no map till a couple of months ago. It is only from time to time I can get this map.

3822. Can you tell me whether the houses on Leinster-road are all drained into the main sewer?—They are—I live on the road myself.

3823. Should there not be some means of knowing what the drainage at Portobello Barracks is, and all the places about there?—Yes, I know it. I see my where the sewer gets in on our sewer, but I don't know anything about the private sewers in the barracks.

3824. With respect to the water, you say that the principal main runs up Rathgar, and that the connecting mains are turned off at night—who keeps the key?—The man who keeps the engine.

3825. Supposing a fire happens, what is he to do—he has to stop his engine, and run down and open the cocks at the different mains, and what is become of the engine in the mean time?—There is another man who lives on the premises, and manages to be in his place, and the police give notice to the man if any thing occurs.

3826. How far from that is the place where the hose is kept with the hydrant?—In the Commissioners' yard.

3827. How far is that off?—At the end of Leinster-road.

3828. That is not a quarter of a mile off!—Not so far.

3829. Is it the same man who is to keep the hose and turn the water off?—No; we get plenty of men to assist him.

3830. That is, if they were wakened up at night. Do you look after this hose yourself and see whether it is in order?—I do; no later than last night we had an alarm of fire and we had it out. It was an old chimney that got on fire; we got the hose oiled and washed in the yard.

3831. Mr. Corcoran.—You know the district about Terenure?—Yes.

3832. It is outside Rathmines!—Yes.

3833. How is it supplied with water?—The Varty water goes through Broadtown.

3834. It is supplied with Varty?—Yes; there is a pipe goes across Leeson-park and up Rathgar-road, as far as Broadtown.

3835. Is it drained?—I think Mr. Gray made a very good sewer down the road.

3836. Do you think it would be any advantage for that district to be included in the Rathmines township?—I could not tell you that.

3837. On the Milltown people?—It would be a very good thing for them.

3838. How do you manage about the maintenance of the joint roads?—We divide them into half; we do the whole of one half, and the county the rest. We measure the length and take half and do the whole of the half, and that prevents men from clashing.

Mr. Evans, recalled.

Mr. Evans

3839. CHAIRMAN.—Before this police sergeant was appointed, had you ever an inspector of mainsew?—We had an inspector up to 1874, and he was made sub-military officer then.

3840. His office?—No; except the Town Hall.

3841. Did he ever keep a book and bring it every week before the Commissioners, giving a detail of what was done?—He made his reports to me, and I reported it to the Board,

REUBEN THOMAS PATTERSON, examined.

Mr. Benjamin T. Patterson

3842. Mr. Walker, q.c.—You are a civil engineer?—Yes.

3843. Your offices are in Kildare-street?—Yes.

3844. And you are the owner of house property in Rathmines?—Yes.

3845. And also some in Pembroke township?—Yes.

3846. I believe you have the management of some other property in the Rathmines township?—Yes.

3847. Have you other house property in the city?—Yes.

3848. I know from your professional position you

can speak of these matters; are the roads in Rathmines in good order?—In fair order.

3849. Are you satisfied with the supply of gas and water?—Yes; I have no reason to complain. I have heard from several, and there is no doubt that the water is a little hard, but otherwise pure: it appears to be fair water, but I prefer soft water for household purposes.

3850. Was this house property you have in Rathmines built since the township was formed?—Some of it was built before, and some since.

Dawson.
May 21, 1878.
Mr. Beaumont
T. Patterson.

3831. Was it purchased by you since?—It was.

3832. Does that also apply to your purchase in Pembroke?—Yes.

3833. What is your opinion about annexation?—I don't think it would be desirable at all, and I don't wish it.

3834. What are the reasons that influence you in that opinion?—Well, I don't think the management of the Corporation is such as would cause one in the township outside to wish to be joined with them. I think we manage as well ourselves, and the probable result would be an increase of taxation, without any guarantee for better management, but possibly the possibility of much worse.

3835. Do you say that as an owner of property both in the city and township?—I do.

3836. You are not a Commissioner?—No.

3837. Are you satisfied with the way the administration of affairs is conducted in the township?—Generally fairly; of course complaints can be raised against almost anybody—in fact, I may say, any public body.

3838. From your position you are acquainted with this question of the valuation of the city?—Yes.

3839. Should the city be revalued?—Yes; I think it most absurd, and a gross injustice, the present valuation. I think it is a question the Corporation seem to pay very little attention to, but which appears to me of more vital importance to them than the quest of new territory by far.

3840. From your professional position and knowledge, I presume you have often had occasion to value premises?—Yes.

3841. In different parts of the city?—Yes.

3842. Can you give me any striking instances which have come under your notice?—I have had a very large tract of property to value lately in connexion with the South City Market scheme, and there the question of value was put very strongly before me; I have known instances where the gross annual value was from three to eight times the valuation for taxation. It was perfectly absurd; there was one case—a man was paying £52 a year for many years back, for a very considerable holding, and his valuation was £5 a year.

3843. Mr. Heron.—Was that case where he had rebuilt within that time?—No.

3844. Is that the baly's house?—It is, and there is another case in which the valuation for taxation is only £6 a year; whereas the man paid a ground rent of £12.

3845. CHAIRMAN.—It is alleged that some people are valued ten times higher than others?—That is what I say; it is altogether out of proportion, and if the city were properly revalued, if I am to judge the rest of the city from my experience of this part of it, a revaluation, on a proper basis, of the entire city, ought nearly to double the income of the Corporation with the same percentage of taxation. I made a long abstract of one block of property, in which I put down my gross yearly valuation, and valuing for the company I am supposed not to go too high.

3846. Mr. Walker.—You value for the company?—Yes, and I think Mr. Heron knows that very well, for he used to complain against my absurdly low valuation.

3847. CHAIRMAN.—That is when you were for the company, but if he were at your side he would praise you?—In the central block of property my gross yearly valuation was £5,034; the valuation of that block is £947, and assuming that sixty per cent. of my gross annual valuation would give a fair valuation for taxation, it would give a valuation for taxation of, in or about, £1,844, while the present one is £947, showing a loss to the Corporation of £887 a year.

3848. Mr. Walker.—Nearly half?—Yes, so that half the poundage would give the same income to the Corporation if the city was properly valued.

3849. Mr. Heron.—That is the block at the corner of Exchequer-street?—Yes.

3850. Have you got any calculation of what the

company paid for it?—No, but I know they paid for above my calculation, so that I am much under the value in that matter. Cowes was valued at £1,380, and they had to pay £2,000 for that. In that case my valuation was £177, and the valuation for taxation was only £32, and that is very nearly six times.

3851. Mr. Walker.—Do you think that fairly represents generally the under valuation of the city?—I could not say that, because I never had experience over so large an area before.

3852. CHAIRMAN.—The general opinion is that the valuation would be raised to £950,000, instead of £600,000—I think that is greatly due to the existence of the townships. I consider the townships rather factors of the city, than outsiders sucking from its resources. If an experiment was tried of putting a prohibitory duty on everything purchased in the city by the inhabitants of the townships and making them trade elsewhere, you would find the city very different after a while.

3853. Do you not approve of Mr. M'Evey's suggestion of having a turnpike on the roads?—No.

3854. Mr. Walker.—He put it on as an obnoxious argument—do you think the streets in the townships are in a better condition than those in the city?—Yes; I think the townships as a whole are better than the city.

Cross-examined by Dr. Norwood.

3855. Practically Ruthin and Dublin form a continuously built city?—Yes.

3856. And the same occurs in the case of Pembroke. Practically, they are one city, divided by a narrow belt of canal?—Yes.

3857. Do you approve of the principle which the Legislature has sanctioned of making the whole of the metropolitan police area contribute to the support of the bridges of Dublin?—I think it is a fair principle; that is a county work and a county necessary to cross rivers.

3858. Do you think it a fair principle to make the city contribute to the roads through Ruthin and Pembroke townships, from which they draw no rates?—No; I don't think it would.

3859. You would not think that fair?—I don't think it fair at all.

3860. Do you think it fair to levy off the citizens of Dublin £400 a year for the repair of the Rock-road, when they get no taxes out of it?—I don't think it is, but I don't know the facts of that case at all.

3861. You admit that, as far as the bridges are concerned, they have a community of interest?—Yes.

3862. Do you think it fair that they should also have a common police force?—I think that is desirable.

3863. Do you think it is fair to handicap the city with £5,000 a year for the support of a police force, out of which the outlying districts have a common benefit?—I don't exactly understand that.

3864. Suppose they pay 6d in the pound in the valuation all over the metropolitan district for the support of the metropolitan police, do you think it is fair to put an addition to that on the citizens of £5,000 a year?—I don't think it would be unreasonable at all.

3865. Why would it not be unreasonable?—Because the people the police have to look after mostly congregate in the bad parts of the city.

3866. Are you aware that for that class of people there is no decent accommodation in Ruthin or Pembroke, and that as successive they must flock into the city. I mean artisans and the like?—I don't refer to artisans at all. I mean the worst classes. I mean the criminal classes.

3867. You have no criminal class and no place for them to dwell in the township?—We have to support them.

3868. Are you aware that any criminals in Ruthin and Pembroke are tried in the city?—I suppose they are. That follows from there being one police force.

3869. Our appliances for the administration of jus-

the are provided, and the Pembroke and Rathmines townships contribute nothing, whereas the city supplies the courthouse and the reporter, and everything of that sort!—That would only be a small matter.

3890. But the principle is good!—It stands in the same category as the £5,000 a year.

3891. What do you say about the fire brigade? Do you think it necessary to have a united management and a proper fire brigade for the whole district?—I don't see any necessity for united management; but I think there should be a fire brigade, and unity would lessen the expense, but there is no absolute necessity for it.

3892. Would you think that fire should be extinguished in the Rathmines and Pembroke townships at the cost of the city, and without their paying anything for it?—They are paying nothing for it, and I think it would be very good of the city to give the fire brigade for nothing.

3893. Suppose they have done so!—I think they ought to make them pay for their services.

3894. Suppose they refuse!—Well, I cannot make them.

3895. Do you think it fair that they provide no efficient brigades for themselves, and that they should have recourse to the city authorities?—I would leave them to themselves the next time if they refused to pay.

3896. They have a common gas supply from common works!—Yes.

3897. Are you aware whether they have means of testing the quality of gas. I suppose it is supplied direct to Rathmines!—I don't know.

3898. You have come here to praise the management of the Commissioners, and you should surely know!—Not to praise. I did not come to do that. I don't praise any one.

3899. You did not come to injure them!—I came to protect my own interests. I don't care about the Commissioners.

3900. But you think they have a common case to supply defence!—I don't know, but I would imagine there is no necessity for testing the gas, for I suppose it comes through the same pipes contamniously as those that supply the city.

3901. And the city pays for the test!—We don't want the test.

3902. Are you aware the city does it hour by hour?—I know there is such a person as a gas examiner.

3903. Should you like to avail yourselves of the test?—I don't want it at all; what you ask me is, was I aware there was a means of checking the gas, and I answered, "I don't think there is any necessity for it."

3904. Do you think it is fair, if there be a necessity for it, that the city should pay for all the appliances, and the officers for doing it?—I think the city should pay for their own, and if they choose they may insist on the company giving a separate supply and laying down separate pipes for the townships, but I don't think they should ask the townships to pay for what they do of necessity for themselves.

3905. They have a common supply of gas!—There is only one works.

3906. A number get their water from the Vartry!—Yes.

3907. Have you heard any complaints in Rathmines about the quality of the water!—I don't know of any complaints, except as to hardness.

3908. Would it not be well to have a better supply?—No; it would be pleasanter for household purposes.

3909. Have you heard any complaints about pressure?—I have seen a statement about it from time to time in the papers, but I have not been troubled with any want of pressure in my district. There is a system of constant supply.

3910. Have you heard the evidence about the sanitary staff?—Would you be surprised to learn that they have only one sanitary officer!—He must be a very valuable man.

3911. Mr. Walker.—I would be surprised to hear

it, knowing that there is not a word of foundation for it.

3912. By Nossead.—Do you know anything about the proceedings of the Corporation? Were you ever present at their meetings?—No.

3913. Were the public admitted?—I don't know. I never troubled myself to ask.

3914. You don't know what goes on inside the Commissioners' Hall!—No.

3915. CHAIRMAN.—I see you live yourself in Upper Leeson-street, that is in the township!—Yes.

3916. And your offices where you make your money is at 11, Kildare-street; do you pay any rates for 11, Kildare-street?—No; but I spend a great deal of money with the shopkeepers who do, that is why I blame the Corporation. The townships spend money in the city, increase the value of the business premises enormously, and they have concluded to have these premises re-valued, and thereby raise their income. I say it is the townships growing round Dublin that increase enormously the value of business premises and offices in the city.

3917. Do you drive yourself largely through the streets of Dublin?—I do, on back cars, and they pay the taxes for it.

3918. You use the streets, and carmen pay the taxes!—And he charges me for it.

3919. In the fares!—Yes; and I say the shopkeepers should be taxed properly.

3920. Supposing that your taxes were lessened in Pembroke, would you like to be attached to Dublin?—If our taxes were lessened, and that we get proper representation, and that you guarantee that, I go to the other side at once.

3921. Supposing that the taxes were lessened in Pembroke, and that Pembroke got a number of town councillors to represent it in the Corporation, what would you say then, and that you could thereby get Vartry water?—I would say, "amen to."

3922. According to your own account, if the city was revalued, the income of the Corporation would be doubled, and there is only a difference at present of £d. between the taxes of Pembroke and Dublin. It is from 3s. 7d. to 3s. 8d. in Pembroke, and in Dublin it is 4s. 4d. If that is so, would not the taxation of Pembroke be lessened by annexation at once?—Unquestionably; but don't put that word doshing into my mouth. I said that the block I dealt with was very nearly double the value.

3923. Then, supposing you increase it even one-third, the rate on that one-third will at once make up more than the difference between what Pembroke pays and what Dublin pays—if the Corporation do that, and reduce their taxation, then we won't have any difficulty in annexing the townships. If they manage their own affairs properly, then let them come and seek annexation with the townships.

3924. I think it is a mistake to suppose that the Corporation are trying to do this. The Government have sent out, in consequence of the Report of the Select Committee, this Commission to see what is right to be done, and then the Corporation come forward and give their views on the matter, and they say, "give us the management of these townships", and the townships say they don't want that!—But I say that is the Corporation. It is just the same as if they brought in a Bill.

3925. Supposing now the Corporation are able to say that if the townships were annexed and the city properly re-valued, there would be a diminution in the taxation of Pembroke—would you be in favour of annexation or not?—I would not be in favour of annexation until they had proved these things to be facts. Let them show by their management that they can do such things, and then I will consider the question.

3926. They have shown they will have £7,000 a year more, property income, within a year and a half, and also that, within twenty years, suppose every life in the existing household live to be seventy-five years

PAPER 49.
May 21, 1879
Mr. Parnell
T. Parsons.

DONATE.
May 21, 1893.
Mr. T. J. Jenkins
T. Patterson.

old, they will have £10,000 a year more, and also, that they are paying off the Vartry debt at the rate of £19,000 a year, and with an increased valuation besides, what would you say to annexation?—All I can say is, they must not have faith in what they are trying to prove themselves, or they would not be taking us in for the purpose of reducing our taxation.

3937. But it is for the purpose of reducing their own taxation as well!—It cannot be that either. If annexation is to reduce our rates, our annexation cannot possibly reduce theirs.

3938. They say there can be a great saving of expense effected by having one staff for everything, and besides, the annexation they propose is not a very large one. In Cork they proposed four miles, and the greatest distance here is three miles. They say that, instead of having five townships, with five surveyors, five sets of sanitary officers, independent of fire brigades and all that, put all under one management, and there can be a great saving effected!—But I don't agree with that, for the amalgamation of scavengers and workmen, which would really be the large source of outlay, would not make any man do more work; you must have all the men still, and the constant complaint is, that the officers of the city have too much to do, and they are always appointing new ones, and if they get new work on them they will appoint new men every week.

3939. Do you think Rathmines should pay a large sum yearly to keep up the police force of Dublin?

proper!—I don't know what you mean by police force proper.

3940. At present the force is 700 in the city, and the outlying districts is under 400. I suppose if Rathmines stood by itself thirty or forty would do, but you have to pay your share to keep up 700 police for Dublin!—But you are putting it in a very different light from what Dr. Norwood put it. He said that the Corporation, in addition to the taxation for police, paid £5,000 a year to keep up the courts.

3941. But I am dealing with the eight pence which the whole metropolitan district pays!—But I don't know that the £5,000 a year will cover the difference.

3942. Certainly not!—I don't know that.

3943. Don't you know that the Dundrum district does not pay a farthing of the bridge taxes?—I don't know.

3944. They do not; it is confined to the metropolitan district, Clontarf, and some other districts, and all the enormous district of Dundrum does not pay one penny!—Are you going to tax them, and make them pay taxes if they don't pay bridge taxes?

3945. You say you recognise the rights of the legislature to tax them for the bridges, because it is a costly work, and I ask you should they pay it?—I think they ought to pay their proportion of it.

3946. Do you think the people of Rathmines and Pembroke use the city for their amusement largely?—I think they do, and they pay for it. They pay the owners of property their rents; and the property owners pay in their taxation.

Mr. H. Brett.

Mr. HENRY BRETT, examined.

3947. Mr. Adshead, Q.C.—You are a civil engineer of long experience?—Yes.

3948. You are county surveyor of the county Wicklow?—Yes.

3949. Are you intimately acquainted with the townships of Rathmines and Pembroke?—I am.

3950. Do you know the state of the roads in Rathmines?—I do.

3951. That is a matter from being county surveyor you are a competent judge of?—I have frequent opportunities.

3952. Will you tell the Commissioners what you consider the condition of the Rathmines roads and the Pembroke roads?—They are very fairly kept generally.

3953. Do you consider them as good or better than the mode of keeping the Dublin streets?—I think, so far as a comparison can be drawn in the same class of streets, they are better kept in the townships.

3954. That is macadamised streets?—Yes.

3955. Something has been said about Grosvenor Square, Rathmines—do you know anything about it?—A little.

3956. Do you know anything of the sewage there?—I superintended a house built there fifteen or sixteen years ago, and the drainage of the house was carried out under my directions. The houses are all drained into a sewer at the rate that is carried down through the cement ground.

3957. And are these houses properly and sufficiently sewered?—We don't doubt about it.

3958. Have you ever considered this question of annexation?—I thought a good deal about it; it seems to me a very large question, and, while I would like to see a very efficient central control, I am certainly in favour of having each district governed by its own people. I would like to see governing power over all of them, for I think a good deal is required in the adjustment of taxation, and there is a good deal requires investigation and settlement by the legislature acting fairly by all parties; but I am entirely in favour of each place, as a governing body, retaining all authority and central control.

3959. CHAIRMAN.—What do you call central control?—That it be seen to often either by the Corporation

or the townships. It should have a central Board in the shape of a senate, to advise and direct the Corporation as well as the townships.

3960. Do you mean in the nature of the Metropolitan Board of Works in London?—Something of that kind.

3961. Mr. Heron.—You state that the roads in the townships are in good order?—I do.

3962. Have you been in Pembroke in winter?—I have, several times; I saw them after reading a report in the newspapers of a complaint made by one of the Dublin Corporation, and I made a special examination of the roads in the township, and Wellington-road in particular, of which the complaint was made; I found them in very good order, without reasonable ground of complaint.

3963. You know the way the drainage is constructed on the right hand side of Pembroke-road as you leave town. Do you approve of that?—Yes; I am quite in favour of having all the water-tables paved. I think all the water-channels there are in need of paving.

3964. What do you think of the water-channels at Pembroke-road?—I think they are in a bad condition, but they could be made much better.

3965. Didn't you see the approaches inside the Little gardens choked up with mud?—Last winter was an exceptional one, and it forms no comparison.

3966. But were the places choked up for three months in that way?—I could not say that, but when I saw them in April and several months before, they were certainly in need of improvement. The surface of the roads, however, was fairly maintained, I mean especially on the right hand side going out. I think having a paved channel would be a great improvement.

3967. Was there an obstruction of mud for half a mile running along the road?—I cannot charge my memory with that.

3968. As regards the central control, do you mean a body that would have a right to interfere with the adjustment of taxation?—I do.

3969. And that would have the power of taxation?—Would have power of suggesting and advising.

3970. But I mean power to strike a rate?—No; I

DECEMBER
May 21, 1878.
Mr. Henry
Brett.

think the power to strike a rate should be in the local body, subject to the control and advice of the central body.

3951. But unless the central body lodged an appeal to reduce the rate, what would be the object of having them?—I would give that vote or power of advice. All my experience is, that the local bodies are always prepared to do what is fair and right in the main.

3952. That is not your opinion of the central body?—No; I think there are occasions when the central body should be called upon to interfere—that is in the case in all boards.

3953. Are you in favour of the Commissioners not meeting in public or private?—Well, I think there is a great deal to be said about both sides of the question. I think the business is better done in private, but still I don't see any objections to having the meetings public.

3954. Are you in favour of public audit?—Quite so.

3955. As regards the water in Rothmines, do you approve of the water from the canal?—I think it is as good as can be, under the circumstances of the case.

3956. Don't you consider the Vauxhall better water?—I think it is generally better for general purposes.

3957. Don't you think the township, regardless of expense, should procure the best supply of water which can be had?—That is one of the reasons I think the central body should have a great amount of control over. It is like a local government board and a board of guardians.

3958. But do you agree with me in saying that the townships should get the best water, regardless of expense?—They ought.

3959. Don't you also approve of their having a united fire brigade in Dublin for all the townships?—That is a matter of private arrangement. I think a large township should have its own arrangements. I think the central body ought to have power to advise and direct.

3960. Now, if each township had its own firebrigade, how many of a brigade should it have, do you think?—I could not say.

3961. If each township had its own brigade, they would require a greater number than if there was a central brigade?—Even so, and I think it would be more efficiently done, and there may be fires at different places at the same time.

3962. Then they say it would be more expensive?—Yes, even if it would be more expensive—what then?

3963. You don't mind these items of expense as regards water or fire brigade?—If they must be well done you must pay for them; it is not possible for a township or city to be well managed unless there is a corresponding expenditure.

3964. Do you think the expenditure of Rothmines at present is sufficient?—I think it has been very fairly and judiciously managed on the whole.

3965. Two shillings in the pound is the taxation?—I think it is a moderate taxation.

3966. Do you think that there is sufficient expenditure on the township?—I would imagine probably it should be a little more.

3967. Would you approve of having crossings on the different roads?—I would.

3968. Ought that not to be done at once?—It ought.

3969. Don't you think the Vauxhall water ought to be introduced?—I think it ought; but that would cost a good deal of money.

3970. Don't you also think, on the whole, it would be better to hold the meetings of the Commissioners in public?—That is a question I would leave for themselves to decide. If I were a Commissioner, I would arrange their meetings being in public; but I would leave it to themselves to decide.

3971. Don't you think the township should be better lighted?—It is fairly lighted as it is.

3972. But don't you think it should be better lighted?—I don't see any necessity for it.

3983. Don't you think the sewerage capable of improvement—I believe so; for as I know Rothmines is as well served as it can be until the large question of the main drainage is carried out. I believe it is pretty well attended to in that way.

3984. Mr. Andrews.—You know Pembroke-road?—Yes.

3985. Well, the water channels are somewhat deficient there?—Yes.

3986. And that is a road which we have no control over, except to contribute to the Grand Juries of the city and county?—Yes.

3987. Mr. Corcoran.—Do you think £120 a year expenditure for the roads on sweeping and watering is sufficient?—I do.

3988. CHAIRMAN.—Salaries, £127; £12 for sewage—what do you think of that?—I don't think that is sufficient.

3989. Or anything like it?—No.

3990. £87 for salaries, and sanitary works £45—what do you think of that?

3991. Mr. Walker.—Mr. Evans has explained that over and over again.

3992. CHAIRMAN.—If you look you will see the sewer opening department cost £31 18s. 7d.

3993. Mr. Walker.—He says that is included in the labour and materials in repair of the roads, and not in sanitary expenditure.

3994. Mr. Corcoran.—But Mr. Evans said, the repairs of sewers and the connections with them were included in the labour also.

3995. Mr. Evans.—In the labour alone. Anyone making a joining to a sewer supplies everything, and it is mere labour with us. There are large sewer works to be carried out by the Local Government Board, and there they had to receive the sanction of the Local Government Board, and Mr. Cobett required the work to be carried out as they wished it.

3996. Witness.—I built some houses at Kinnlworth-square, and the sewers were carried out under the care of Mr. Johnson, and very great attention was paid to see that the houses were properly drained into the main sewer, so that there might be no cesspools or anything of that kind allowed at all.

Examination of MR. BRETT resumed.

3997. CHAIRMAN.—Are you in favour of the extension of existing townships?—I am, under certain circumstances.

3998. And is not that on the ground that the people living within a certain distance from the town derive exceptional advantages from having the town as a market town, and for going into and using it as they require it?—My opinion is, as I stated before on a former occasion, that there is a reciprocal state of things between the townships and the surrounding districts, and where there is no governing body at present, I am in favour of one, and where there is a governing body I would retain it as in the townships about Dublin.

3999. At Bray you were in favour of an extension for a mile and a half one way; on the like grounds would you think the district of Ratoath should be added?—I think it should, and that Dolphin's-dam and that district should also be added in. As there are no governing bodies, I think they ought to be added—they should be added to the existing bodies.

4000. And the same as regards Terenure?—Yes.

4001. To what extent do you think Rathfarnham and Pembroke ought to be extended?—To the extent that you have now indicated.

4002. That is an extension of two miles from the present boundary?—That would be fair.

4003. Would you say that the district of Rathfarnham and all the houses lying between Beechick and Dundrum ought to be brought in?—Yes.

4004. To what extent would you go?—From the centre of Rathmines for one and a half to two miles; but I would not interfere with any existing authority. I

DUBLIN,
May 21, 1873.
Mr. Henry
Brett.

would add in where there is no governing body already.

4005. From your experience would you say that if these five townships round Dublin were under one management there would be a great saving of money? —I don't think so.

4006. Instead of having five different surveyors and staffs, if you had only one, don't you think there would be a saving? —I don't think so. I would certainly have a central control power to make them all do what is right, and carry out their various duties.

4007. At present Mr. Johnston gets £300 a year, and Pembroke has a surveyor also, and so with the other townships! —You would have precisely the same thing under another name, and these should be divided into districts, and one person of much higher standing placed at the head of each, and the same expense would be incurred.

4008. Mr. CORROK.—Do you think the townships have enough to employ one man each? —Clearly.

4009. CHAPMAN.—Out of the reasons you gave at Bray was that the people outside largely used and cut up the roads at Bray? —No doubt.

4010. And you suggested there that they should be brought into Bray? —Yes.

4011. Would not the same argument hold good in regard to Rathmines and Pembroke, don't the people there much more largely use the streets of Dublin than the people outside Bray use the streets of Bray? —The people of Dublin also use the Rathmines and Pembroke streets, and there is a mutuality.

4012. You were asked at Bray whether the visitors, and particularly the English people who came there, did not largely use the roads outside, going to the Dargle, so on? —No doubt; but one of the main things which operates in my view in regard to Bray, is the enhancement of its value by reason of its contiguity, and, therefore, to the expense of the town they should contribute.

4013. Don't you think one thing that has contributed to the value of Rathmines, is that the houses out side there escape the city taxation although they have all the advantages of the city? —There is no doubt of that.

4014. If the gentlemen outside Bray contribute something towards Bray, why should not the Rathmines people pay something towards Dublin? —I say

that is one of the things that should engross the attention of the legislature very closely, to form a fair and equitable adjustment of the taxation, and there should be some reasonable contribution, and all the circumstances should be weighed maturely and carefully.

4015. Are you aware, at present, that the Metropolitan Police district of Dublin, pays 2d. in the pound for the support of the bridges; is it your opinion that the townships should pay that tax, and also pay something towards keeping up the streets of Dublin and the scavenging of them, where they are the city so largely? —I think that would deserve very grave consideration; in my opinion, there should be some small rate in aid from the townships for keeping up the streets of Dublin.

4016. Leaving them to manage themselves, and levy that rate in aid? —Yes; something very moderate, and after careful consideration of the benefits the city derived by the townships, as well as the townships making use of the city.

4017. Are you aware that the artisan class who work in these townships live principally in the city? —I believe so.

4018. Then to a certain extent, does not that put a great tax on the city? —No doubt it does.

4019. Of which people in the country get the benefit? —That arises from a variety of causes; the houses that the artisans now occupy were houses of a better class, and by reason of the decay of the city, and probably for want of due care, the artisans are driven into those houses, and so it has cost them probably much by the Corporation not keeping up the city.

4020. Is it not also caused by the fact that in Rathmines and Pembroke the houses are built more for the better class, while those suited for the artisan class are in the city? —No doubt.

4021. Now, don't you think that largely increases the taxation of the city? —I am sure it does.

4022. Don't you think the people get the benefit of that in the townships by using these artisans, and not contributing anything to the burden thus put on the city? —Yes.

4023. You say you consider that should be gone into in connection with the question of the maintenance and scavenging of the roads and streets of the city, and of the bridges, and all that? —Yes, precisely.

Mr. Edward
Potter.

MR. EDWARD POTTER EXAMINED.

4024. MR. ANDREWS, Q.C.—You are chairman, I believe, of the Rathmines Commissioners since Mr. Stokes' illness? —I am.

4025. How long have you been chairman of the Commissioners? —A year and a half.

4026. Your residence is in Rathmines? —Yes.

4027. But you have a good deal of interest in the city also? —Yes.

4028. You were a Commissioner before? —I was.

4029. For how many years have you been a Commissioner? —From between eight and nine years.

4030. Have you formed an opinion upon this question of annexation? —I have; my opinion is, we are able to take care of ourselves in Rathmines.

4031. Would you wish to be brought in under the management of the Corporation? —I would not.

4032. You are one of the Directors of the Hibernian Bank? —Yes.

4033. And also of several public boards? —I am.

4034. Are you able to say in what condition the

roads, and the lighting, and scavenging of Rathmines has been carried on since you became acquainted with the township? —I think everything has been conducted very well. In fact there are very few complaints.

4035. It has been stated here by somebody that the Commissioners rise sharp at ten o'clock in order to get into Dublin, is that so? —No; we meet sharp at nine to the minute. We never have to wait two minutes for the quorum, and we sit as long as there is business before us, and it is understood no fresh business will be begun after ten o'clock, but we discuss matters even until eleven o'clock.

4036. What do you mean by fresh business? —Of which notice has not been given—that is not on the agenda.

4037. MR. CORROK.—What is the agenda usually? —Read Committee reports, Finance Committee reports, and all the letters that come directed to the secretary or chairman are read.

MARK CUMBERLAND BENTLEY examined.

DEBILIS.

May 21, 1878.

Mr. Mark C. Bentley.

4038. CHAIRMAN.—You live in Bathmains?—Yes.
4039. Have you property there?—Yes.
4040. Have you been a Town Commissioner of Bathmains?—Yes.

4041. Are you one now?—No.

4042. What is your view of annexing Bathmains with Dalmuir?—If you will just allow me to inform you, I wish to give you a short history of my connection with the township.

4043. No; I would rather just know what you, as an inhabitant, and as an owner of property, think of the proposal to annex Bathmains—There are over 100 houses on my landed property. I pay but a small amount of improvement rate. The tenants are large contributors to that rate. I am a large contributor to the poor law and income tax, which are of course deducted by my tenants from their rents. Before the setting of this Commission I was opposed to annexation to the city; but I must confess Mr. Pin's evidence made a very strong impression upon me, and modified my views considerably. I only speak my individual views, and I am not to be taken as representing what is called the Varty party in Bathmains, that is a distinct question. I read Mr. Pin's evidence, and I read a very clear statement of Mr. Beveridge, the Town Clerk, and I think it is perfectly clear that we must become contributaries to the metropolis, or be annexed. I think that if we received a fair representation, and assuming what I heard stated here of the solvent state of the Corporation to be correct, annexation might not be objectionable. I have been all my life, or as long as I took any part in public matters, under the impression that the Corporation was in a state of insolvency, but my views are completely changed, and I have come to the conclusion that the Corporation is the converse, and is in a state of solvency. I heard figures stated here, and Mr. Walker did not challenge them, and so I assume they are correct.

4044. I understand that the figures are taken from the last audited account, and Mr. O'Connell, the City Accountant, carried on the accounts up to the 1st April this year, and showed there was a further improvement, and, besides, we have the authority of the Government Auditor at all events that the account passed him as audited up to last year?—We have not a sufficient supply of water in the district of Bathmains—that is my decided conviction, and, I believe, it is shared in by the vast majority of the inhabitants. Mr. Johnston, our surveyor in '76, printed a report for the Town Commissioners, in which he stated a large additional supply of water was necessary, and that complaints were many and frequent. It was then proposed by them to extend the canal supply at a cost of about £20,000 on the extension. I consulted some friends in the township who, I believed, took a very great interest in the water question, and we came to the conclusion that we ought to try and oppose the extension of the canal supply, believing it to be a bad and polluted water. Accordingly we had a preliminary meeting in Bathmains, and it was largely attended, every speaker there expressed his opinion against the extension of the water supply proposed, and the spending of the £20,000, and I called attention to the effect of these proposals, and pointed out that the first estimate made was generally doubled before the completion of the works. The estimate for the Varty water, for instance, was £300,000, but before it was completed it took beyond £500,000, so, therefore, I came to the conclusion that the Commissioners should spend £30,000 or £40,000.

4045. But they would not have to go across rock like the Varty?—That is a matter of opinion; we objected to the canal, and we formed a Committee; about twenty gentlemen generally assembled at my house about once a month; they also assembled at Mr. Archer's, at St. Brendon's, who also took part in trying to get the Varty water, and also at Mr. Eason's, who is a Commissioner now.

4046. Was that gentleman in favour of it?—Yes; Mr. Eason was one of the most pronounced advocates at that time against the Board; we also assembled at Mr. Bagwell's; we had two public meetings, and we passed resolutions in favour of the Varty water, as the poorest and cheapest supply, and condemned the canal; and appointed a deputation to attend the Board in Bathmains.

4047. Was that meeting largely attended by ratepayers of Bathmains?—It was, very largely—a public meeting in every sense of the word.

4048. Did you send in a memorial to the Board?—Yes; and we asked to have a deputation received by the Board, and they granted that, Dr. Stedart was Chairman of our Committee; he takes a great interest in the water question, and he attended with Professor Galloway, Colonel Adamson, Mr. Archer, Rev. Mr. Shire, Senior Curate of Bathmains Church, and myself; we stated our case, and Mr. Stokes handed us in reply a printed statement; it was a brief statement with reference to the Varty water and Canal water, showing on the figures that the Canal water was the cheapest, and would have the most abundant supply; we did not regard his printed statement as at all satisfactory, and we strongly dissented from it.

4049. Do you mean that the canal would give the most abundant supply?—Yes; I have the statement here. Dr. Stedart spoke there, and Mr. Archer, Mr. Shire, and myself, and I wound up my observations by stating that if the Board would take a house to house canvass, we would be perfectly satisfied to decide in that way, and if the majority were in favour of the canal, and that we were in the minority we would abandon agitation on the question, but Mr. Stokes at once refused my proposition; we were informed afterwards, and went through a variety of channels, that he was determined to go on with the canal extension, and we got up some agitation on the question in the township, and it was, I believe, ultimately abandoned or held in suspense; I don't know which, but it was never carried out.

4050. What you say is that, of your own knowledge, there is a feeling on the part of a large number, at all events, I won't say majority, of the ratepayers, that the water supply is not satisfactory?—I believe the majority are in favour of the Varty water, and I believe the Board knew very well they would be defeated on the question if they took a house to house canvass.

4051. You made a proposal that there should be a house to house canvass?—Most positively; and we would have been content with the result; they had the machinery and it would have been easily and swiftly accomplished, and if they had taken the votes in that way of the householders, we would have abandoned agitation on the question.

4052. Was any reason given by Mr. Stokes for that refusal?—No; nor did he consult the Board, but simply told us we had received their answer.

4053. Were there many of the Board present at that time?—It was a full Board.

4054. Did you ever afterwards receive any communication or explanation in answer to the deputation?—No, sir; I had occasional correspondence with the Board, but we did not go on any further deputation to them.

4055. Did the Board ever give you any reason, or give it to the ratepayers, why they did not take any move to get the Varty water, when you say it was the wish of the majority?—Never; members of the Board told me that the Board considered that the householders were not competent to judge the question; it was a question of expense, and that they were not competent to judge it. I complained to them, and I said when the House of Commons conferred an Act of Parliament on certain gentlemen in Ruthmains, for taxing powers, it was for the benefit of the commonwealth, and not for a handful of landlords who chiefly governed the Board.

4056. Do you mean that the gentlemen on the Board were chiefly landlords?—Yes.

DISTRICT.
May 29, 1878.
Mr. Mark C.
Bentley.

4057. Of houses in Bathminton!—Yes, and not only that, but the custom in the township almost universally is that the landlord should pay the taxes. I reside myself in Gloucester-road and pay £100 a year for a house, and my landlord contributes in the same way as to the payment of the taxes; but in the city the converse is the fact, and nearly always the tenants pay the taxes in the city.

4058. There are twenty-one members of the Board, and how many are owners of houses that you say pay the taxes of these houses themselves!—I have not made exactly a calculation, but I think the majority of them are exceedingly large holders of houses, and they pursue a mode of economy at the Board in the government of the township, which I believe the vast majority of the householders are dissatisfied with. We cannot get any information from the Board on any question; it is practically self-elected and irresponsible; they meet every month, and that in secret Committee, and they publish about six lines of a statement of their monthly meetings, and that is only within the last three or four years, prior to that they published no account of their monthly meetings, they published an annual report only. I know the inhabitants are greatly dissatisfied, because they don't receive more information from the Board. The question of the situation of the press is a wide one; there is no doubt there are some evils in connexion with it. It is perfectly idle the suggestion that time would be wasted making speeches if the press were admitted.

4059. Independent of the question of the press, are the ratepayers not allowed to be present at the meetings?—No, sir, they are not; there formerly was an annual meeting when ratepayers were invited to attend, or might attend, but hardly anyone attended. They complained themselves the Board was self-selected, and practically irresponsible, which I believe to be true.

4060. If complaints are to be made by the rate-payers, how do they make them?—Either personally by calling at the secretary's office, or by letter.

4061. And are they not allowed to go before the Board to verify their complaints?—No; the man sending in a complaint does not know whether a dis-

cussion takes place on that complaint at all. It is perfectly idle to send in complaints.

4062. Do you get any answer in writing?—Yes; we always get a reply that it would be laid before the Board.

4063. Do you ever hear what happens as to it?—Sometimes we do, but the majority of people say there is no use in sending in complaints.

4064. But if a complaint is sent in does not the man making it get an opportunity of supporting it before the Board?—They are not ever received before the Board, and the complaints are generally referred to the sanitary officer, or to Mr. Johnston.

4065. Do you mean by the sanitary officer, the hall-porter?—Yes; and Mr. Johnston.

4066. You know Mr. Johnston says he has nothing to do with it?—Yes.

4067. Mr. Walker.—It is according to the nature of the complaint?—Yes.

4068. CHAIRMAN.—Have you made complaints yourself?—I have.

4069. Of what nature?—I made complaints of some laneways in Bathminton some twelve months ago, and I got a reply saying it would be referred to the sub-santitary officer, and to the surveyor. Well, it was not attended to, and I called repeatedly about it, and I was always assured by Mr. Evans it would receive attention. I have the letter in reply I wrote Mr. Evans on that occasion, and they were chiefly connected with some laneways.

4070. Have you got a copy of that?—Yes; (letter dated 4th February, 1878, calling attention to the condition of a laneway at the rear of Kenilworth-square road.)

4071. Were these statements true, to your own knowledge at that time?—Yes.

4072. You treated the surveyor as if he were executive sanitary officer?—I always regarded him as such.

4073. But he is not?—I don't know, but may I ask who is executive officer if he is not?

4074. The hall-porter was until last February; what reply did you get?—There is the reply (reply dated 6th February, 1878, produced and read).

Mr. EVANS recalled and further examined.

4075. CHAIRMAN.—Have you got a copy of the book which you got under the Act, in which all complaints are to be noted?—No; I have the letter.

4076. You were bound to have a book in which all the complaints made by the inhabitants are to be entered, and that book is to show the order made by your Board upon the complaint?—I would be glad to

have any section requiring that read, for I have never seen it.

4077. Were you ever furnished with the forms in 1874 from the Local Government Board?—No; I was furnished with the Act of Parliament.

4078. Did you ever apply for the forms of books sanctioned by that Board?—No.

Mr. MARK C. BENTLEY recalled.

4079. Mr. Cotton.—How is it if the majority of the ratepayers are for the Verte water, and against the Board, they don't turn the Board out?—I will explain that, it is a very small constituency, so to speak. The landlords have the payment of the taxes in their own hands, and if the two meetings of the taxes for the

whole year are not paid by the 31st August in each year, the tenants are deprived of their votes, and hundreds of such cases have occurred on purpose; well, I won't say that, but the tenants at each election complained bitterly of it.

Mr. EVANS again recalled.

4080. CHAIRMAN.—Did you ever get these forms prescribed by the Local Government Board?—I did not.

4081. Did you ever get that form (produced)?—Yes.

4082. In that form the Board are to say what is done with the complaint?—We have all these forms.

4083. Then if you have you should have the order of your Board upon it, for I suppose the moment a complaint came before the Board it was referred by them to the sub-santitary officer?—So it was.

4084. But where is the report of the sub-santitary officer on that, it should be in the book on that form

prescribed by the Local Government Board?—We got these books all printed.

4085. Then if that is so you should have this complaint entered in it?—Probably it is entered.

4086. Mr. Walker.—That section does not apply to this case at all.

4087. CHAIRMAN.—Every complaint made regarding a nuisance should be entered in the books.

4088. Mr. Walker.—I don't remember the section of the Public Health Act, but if it is upon the section which has reference to matters dangerous to public health, I think you will find there is no obligation unless there is some matter existing dangerous to public health.

Mr. BENTLEY recalled.

4089. This is some further correspondence I had on the same matter, and it was not attended to, and I called repeatedly about it.

4090. CHAIRMAN.—Are you able to say that they were never attended to, from the time you made that complaint?—Undoubtedly, they were not, I speak from my own personal inspection; I am upon the property nearly every day (witness read letter of May, '79, to Railways Commissioners, with a reply dated 7th May, 1879). I wrote in reply to that, and the laneways were cleaned immediately. My letter of 3rd May was received by the Secretary on Monday the 5th May, and I believe the laneways were cleaned up that day.

4091. Do you mean that these deposits of ashes and vegetable matter were allowed to remain in these laneways to your own knowledge up to that time?—Certainly. There is one laneway that is there mentioned that belongs to a member of the Board, and when I complained of it to Mr. Evans, he said that it had not been given up to the Board, £5 has to be paid for every laneway given up. Some of the tenants on Kenilworth-square complained bitterly of it, and begged that I would write to the Board on the subject, and they said the owner would not pay £5, and that the Board would not do anything in consequence.

4092. Is there anything in the Railways Act, so far as you know, to enable people on a private road to rest a nuisance?—No, sir, I think not.

4093. That is your answer of the 8th May, '79 (produced)?—Yes.

4094. These laneways were cleaned upon that day?—Yes, and before the Board met.

4095. And you are able to say that before you made the complaints in February, the laneways were not cleaned?—Undoubtedly, and £10 had been paid for giving them up. I would make an observation with regard to these matters. My first letter is in February, '78, and you cannot fail to see that it is a very mild one in its tone and language, and you will observe in the subsequent correspondence I supplemented my first request, contained in these letters, by asking to see the minutes of the Board—they refused to allow me to do that.

4096. Do you mean to say that you repeatedly applied to see the minutes of the Board, and they refused?—Undoubtedly, and that is not dependent on my memory, but it is in writing, and what is written cannot be unwritten.

4097. Do you mean to say you wrote to the Board on the subject?—Yes.

4098. And did you get a letter refusing it?—I did.

4099. Mr. CORRIGAN.—Was what you asked for the minutes generally, or the minutes on any particular subject?—I did not ask for any particular subject.

4100. CHAIRMAN.—Did you request to be allowed to see them?—I did, repeatedly, and explained I was a large property holder, and even if the law was in their favour, it was rather hard lines to have to my, they would not allow me to see their reports.

4101. Mr. Walker.—Where is the letter in which you demanded to see the minutes?

4102. CHAIRMAN.—Is that one of Sept. 17th, '77.

4103. Mr. Walker.—I have found that, but I doubt whether there is any letter in which he demands to see the minutes.

4104. Mr. Bentley.—No, I beg pardon, I asked to be admitted to see the minutes.

4105. Mr. Walker.—I thought you said there was a letter to that effect?—Certainly.

4106. I have a letter here, but it is as to the right of any ratepayer to inspect the books, &c., of the Board, but that is not what the witness mentioned.

4107. Mr. Bentley.—I think it was the minutes I asked for.

4108. Mr. Walker.—I suppose that is your letter (letter produced)?—I observe my signature to it; there is a clerical error in it with reference to the Act of Parliament.

4109. The section you quote gives power to mortgagees and assignees to inspect the accounts?—It was the 90th section; It was an error, my having referred to the 88th section.

4110. This was not an account book?—It was refused, at all events; the book of account, I think, included everything. I wanted to see the minutes, and I will state my reason for endeavouring to see the minutes. We had under our consideration at the Ratepayers' Committee the fact that there was some gentlemen at the Board who were holders of canal stock, and we considered that these gentlemen ought not to take part in the meetings of the Board while they were about to promote the extension of the canal scheme, and we served notice on the Board through the secretary, that we would take proceedings in the event of the Board passing any resolution on the subject to extend the canal supply, as I best recollect, by injunction, with the object of staying them in their proceedings; and I, as I best recollect (I could not lay my hand on the letter), referred to a case in England.

4111. CHAIRMAN.—You made an objection to the Board, and what answer did you get?—I don't think I received any answer as regards that. Some of the gentlemen of the Board were holders of canal stock, and the Secretary of the Board is a very large holder, and is a trustee for the chairman or some member of his family, and we thought this a great hardship.

4112. Did you apprise the Board of that fact?—Yes.

4113. Did you get any answer?—I don't recollect; I am unable to discover any reply.

4114. You stated in one of the letters, read to-day, that you were aware yourself, of your own knowledge, of a number of ratepayers being dissatisfied with the way the laneways were kept. Is that a fact to your own knowledge?—Yes.

4115. To your own knowledge were nuisances allowed to remain for any time on the roads?—Undoubtedly.

4116. And in more places than one?—Certainly.

4117. What is the greatest length of time of which you can speak, from your own knowledge, as regards laneways and streets?—As regards both. On the road I reside on there is a very expensive class of houses, and the roadways in the winter time were impassable. The traffic is enormous on Sundays, especially at the corner of Gloucester-road, and when I was crossing with one of my children I had to carry them over the mud.

4118. But might it not have been swept on Saturday, and get into that way on Sunday?—It was not swept for years.

4119. Of your own knowledge?—Yes. I suggested that the Board should organize a band of small boys for the purpose of sweeping the crossings, but that was refused on the ground of expense. Mr. Shire, Incumbent of Trinity Church, sent in an application for a crossing to that church. There is one at the right hand side, but none at the other; there is enormous foot passenger traffic that way on Sunday, and the Board refused that; and I pressed it upon Mr. Stokes, the then chairman, and he answered me by saying, Mr. Bentley, the rule of the Board is that we only pay for one half of the crossings, and the other half is contributed by the parties who ask for it. I said: Mr. Chairman, that is practically a refusal to grant a crossing, because it is impossible to obtain the parties interested to subscribe; one may subscribe, and another refuse, and thus practically refusing the request.

4120. When did that occur?—When I was a member of the Board.

4121. How long ago?—About a year before I left it. I was out of the Board in December, '76.

4122. Was that application made by this gentleman as curate of the parish for the sake of his parishioners?

DATES.
May 21, 1879.
Mr. Mark C.
Bentley.

DUBLIN,
May 30, 1879.
Mr. Mark C.
Beauley.

—Yes, certainly, and he will be here to be examined.

4123. Has that crossing ever been made since I—No, and when I cross I cross and hundreds cross to church on Sunday they wade through immense quantities of mud and dirt; it is a scandal.

4124. Have crossings been provided in any part of the township?—In some parts, but exceedingly few; and I asked the secretary verbally and in my letter, and I complained frequently in the winter with regard to the absence of gravel and the dreadful condition of the pathways, and he said he was unable to obtain gravel.

4125. When was it he told you that I—Between the date of my first letter and my subsequent letters. It was in the middle of winter.

4126. From your own knowledge of the township, have you yourself seen refuse thrown out on the public streets from the shops?—Constantly, and I have constantly seen heaps of muck on the roadways for months; but, I may add, I have observed the scavengers exceedingly active within the last few months, and particularly during the last month.

4127. Are the people in the shops allowed to sweep out the stuff on the roadways?—They do, occasionally.

4128. Have you seen that yourself?—I have often seen it.

4129. In the streets or lanesways in which gentlemen have got houses and stables, is the refuse from the stables swept out into the lanesways?—Yes; I have observed that in a laneway which I have inspected before I wrote my last letter. It is a laneway off Garville-avenue, which is in a most shocking condition. I inspected that with one of my tenants, Mr. Donnelly, and I went down half the laneway with extreme difficulty. The mud and filth were abominable.

4130. Was there manure lying about?—There was, and the man who was trying to cleanse the place partially said, "I hope you are coming about this laneway." I said, "I am about to write to the Board on the subject; do you reside here?" He said "I do. I have one of these stables, for which I pay 2s. a week;" and I asked him who owned some manure that was there, and he said someone else; and he said Mr. Johnston and Mr. Smith were here, and they offered to cleanse the laneway if one half of the expense was paid by the owners of the stables.

4131. When was this?—A few days before I wrote my letter of the 3rd May.

4132. But is Mr. Smith the sanitary officer?—I don't know; I think he is sanitary inspector, and oversees sewers.

4133. Has that been done?—I didn't inspect it since.

4134. Is that a long laneway?—It is.

4135. And in a populous part of the township?—It is in Garville-avenue, which is very populous, and there are new houses building opposite to it.

4136. Have you any more complaints to make about sanitary matters?—Yes; with regard to the sanitary staff, which is a long complaint in the township—that the Board allow the surveyor to take works on his own account, and that they have not his whole time. He is a most excellent officer, and I won't be understood to say one word to his discredit; but it is not right that he should be allowed to take contracts from gentlemen at the Board and other parties on his own account. Of my own knowledge he is building on Read's road some houses for himself and some for a member of the Board, and it was stated here that a tithe of his time was not given to his own affairs outside the township, but I most emphatically contradict that, and say that three-fourths of his time is given outside the township. I was not long on the Board until I brought the subject of the conditions under which the surveyor was employed before the Board, and Mr. Stokes answered by saying that they could not afford to pay him a full salary, and that he would not give his time under five or six hundred a year, and that they could not afford to pay him so much; and another gentleman characterized me as making

attacks on an old officer of the Board, which is not true, for I have the highest opinion of Mr. Johnston and of Mr. Evans, and they are both excellent officers.

4137. Is it your opinion that the sanitary condition of Rathmines is attended to by the present sanitary body properly?—Certainly not, and I could bring up a hundred witnesses to state that.

4138. Are you aware whether that feeling is shared in by the ratepayers?—Yes, very largely, and Mr. Keen, who is now a member of the Board, constantly complained before he became a member of the Board of the condition of the township, and I have heard him repeatedly say that the sewers in the township were too in a bad condition. He was one of the most pronounced gentlemen against the Board; he was complimentary enough to say that my letters were exceedingly clever, but too rose-coloured, and that I did not hit the Board half hard enough. I have been far more moderate than a great many in the township desire.

4139. Is it your opinion that it would be of advantage to the ratepayers of Rathmines to be annexed to Dublin?—That is my individual opinion provided we had proper representation.

4140. Can you say whether that opinion of yours is shared in by any great number of the ratepayers?—I could not say; I have not had time to make inquiries on the subject. A notice was published by the Town Commissioners sending out voting papers; I don't know whether you have seen them or not, or whether any returns were made or not. I received one of these notices to vote, but I did not vote because I asked the Board to have a house-to-house canvass on the water question and they declined, well knowing they would be defeated.

4141. Is this the notice (produced)?—Yes; it is a most peculiar document, and it has prevented a great many people coming here. It was only issued a few days before our first meeting here; we had no time to call a meeting, or take the census of the township upon it. It speaks by saying that the adjournment of the Municipal Boundaries Commission will take place on Monday next, the 18th inst. I say that it is most misleading, because it asks the naked question, do you wish annexation or not, and they don't state any of the advantages that we would gain, or that we would have the Fire Brigade or the Vartry water, neither of which the Commissioners have been able to give us. Some gentlemen spoke here to-day in opposition, and said he would recommend each township to have a separate Fire Brigade, but the expense would be enormous; we could not stand that in Rathmines. With regard to supposing that the labouring men in the employment of the township, of whom I have full knowledge, would suit in case of a fire, it is the most idle nonsense that ever was talked of.

4142. Do you know the district where it is situated the water is turned off every night from twelve to six?—Nine to six, I do.

4143. Yesterday we were told it was turned off for only one hour; is that a large locality from which it is turned off—are there 100 houses there?—I should say 1,000 houses.

4144. And do people up there know that it is turned off at nine o'clock at night?—Some do and some don't; because if they turn their cocks they have still water in their pipes and cisterns, and unless they drain them out they would not know of it. All my tenants in Brightons-square complained of it, and I called on Mr. Evans to know was it a fact, and he informed me it was. I believe it is turned off in my own house, but I have not tested it.

4145. What would become of that locality after night if a fire occurs?—It may be all consumed.

4146. It is said there is a man at the place who has the cocks and all ready?—I never heard of it.

4147. Have you ever seen the Fire Brigade drilling or practising?—No; but I have a gentleman here who attended the last fire, and he will give information on the subject. There has been no drilling of the men; it is perfect nonsense.

4148. Somebody said the men were drilled, and that Mr. Johnston was most efficient at it!—Nonsense.

4149. Mr. CORROZ.—If the majority of the rate-payers are against the Board, why not turn them out?—The Board consists of twenty-one members—eighteen for Rothmines, and three for Bushygar—and seven of these gentlemen go out each year. The Board is supposed to be renewed every three years, under the local acts. When these seven gentlemen go out, the whole Board combine to return the six for Rothmines, and one for Bushygar; they use every influence in their power—and it is a very influential Board—and they not only do combine, but they send out, as they did at the last election, circulars. All, except Mr. Parker and Mr. Fostrell, who did not take any part in the matter, sent out private circulars, which, I believe, the Board had prepared; Dr. Ward and other gentlemen sent out private circulars, saying they would feel much obliged if you would vote for so and so. Thus, in point of fact, you have the combined forces of the Board against say new blood, or new member, entering.

4150. Is that what is called a house list!—Perfectly so. There is a very powerful coal interest which we have to contend against at the Board, in connexion with the Varsity water—a coal interest of over £500,000 Canal Stock largely held by the members of the Board, and Mr. Evans, the secretary (I would rather not refer to those names, but really the decisions in Rothmines are so completely in the hands of the Board, and are such a thorough farce, that I am obliged to do so). I was about to state at the beginning, the circumstances under which I came on the Board, and if I stated my case from Alpha to Omega, it would be the shortest way. Before I went into the Board I got a letter from Mr. Stokes stating a vacancy was about to occur at the Board, and that they considered that as I was a large property holder I was entitled to a seat. I consulted some friends of mine, who knew that I always was against the administration of the Board, I said I did not like to be co-opted, that I understood the system was pursued at the Board to an extraordinary extent, that it hampered and fettered the action of members, that when they went in there they were afraid to express an independent opinion. My friends said "Mr. Bentley if you don't wish to be co-opted you may stay out, for the Board is a self-elected body, and you won't ever be able to get in." We advise you to go in, for there is no information given to the rate-payers, except the annual report, and we advise you to go in." I said I understood that the system of co-opting had not been always fully exercised, and that I might lie under some imputation going in; that it was generally reported (these gentlemen told me) that Mr. Stokes (Chairman), had been turned out on one or two occasions by the rate-payers, and that a member of the Board at once retired to allow Mr. Stokes to be co-opted. I don't know that, myself, of my own knowledge, a gentleman will be here who knows about it.

4151. But ultimately you joined the Board!—I did.

4152. Did you ever bring forward at the Board any resolution that the public should be allowed in?—They did not conduct their business in that way. A gentleman I endeavoured to get into the Board, Dr. Harvey, after he became a member, handed in a notice of motion to Mr. Stokes in connexion with some reform about water or something of that sort, and Mr. Stokes handed it back, saying "We don't do business in that way." There was hardly any question put to the vote, with the exception of two occasions, during eight or nine years, and one of these was as to the election of a collector, and the other was on a resolution which Mr. Hodgeson moved for a road committee. We had no road committee up to that time. Mr. Hodgeson was as dissatisfied as I was.

4153. Did he succeed in getting a road committee appointed!—He did, I think, I seconded the resolution, and Mr. Stokes threatened to retire from the Board, and said he regarded it as a vote of censure on

him, and Mr. Johnston, the surveyor. I never knew anything to be carried at the Board against Mr. Stokes's wishes, except on that occasion.

4154. The sum and substance of it is then that you, as a ratepayer and from having been on the Board yourself, are not satisfied with the action of the Board?—Certainly not; and I believe the majority of the ratepayers would wish the meetings to be thrown open to the press. We can get no information otherwise.

4155. Up to the time of the public audit did you get the accounts?—There was an annual account published. It was I was instrumental in getting the public audit—I mean I prepared the requisition.

4156. Are you satisfied with the lighting of the town?—I am not.

4157. Is there sufficient lighting in your opinion?—Certainly not.

4158. At what hours are the lamps lighted and put out—I am at home very early, and I don't exactly know; but there are various roads very badly lighted, and, I believe, the illuminating power of the gas is of bad quality. I have it in my own house.

4159. Mr. CORROZ.—If you had access to the minutes, and were allowed to see them, would it answer as well as if the proceedings were reported?—No; I would rather have the proceedings reported for the benefit of the township generally.

4160. CHAIRMAN.—When you asked to see the minutes, were any reasons assigned except what you have given in your letter?

(Witness reads his letter to Mr. Evans in reference to inspection of the minutes, and Mr. Evans's reply, also further letter from witness.)

4161. Did you get any further answer from them?—No.

4162. They never answered your other letter!—Not beyond that the inspection was refused; I was certain they would refuse it. There is a subject constantly mentioned by the Board: they say if the press was admitted it would lead to specifying, now nine-tenths of the Board are of the same way of thinking, and the idea of any political or religious matters coming in there is perfect nonsense. There is a standing rule, whether written or unwritten I don't know, that no politics or religious questions are to be discussed at the Board, and I would strenuously uphold this rule. No man would be eloquent on sewage or paving stones and such unseaworthy subjects. The whole reason for meeting in private is that they want to exclude information from the ratepayers. The governing power is in the hands of the landlords, and they in the main, with some exceptions, are against the Varsity water and every other expense, and the householders are in favour of it. That is the plain English of the case.

4163. You spoke of adequate representation, supposing Rothmines was annexed to Dublin, what would you say as to representation for Rothmines?—I think the surrounding townships should have twenty members, and the Corporation reduced by that number.

4164. Reducing the Corporation to forty members, and adding twenty members for the townships!—Yes.

4165. That would be something like this: if the valuation of Dublin has raised to something like £800,000, and that of the townships £400,000, you would give four members to Dublin for the valuation of £800,000, and half that number (twenty) to the townships for the valuation of £400,000!—Yes; it should be based on the valuation of the property, but the Corporation propose about fifteen members.

4166. They propose forty-five for Dublin and fifteen for the townships, and you say forty for Dublin and twenty for the townships!—Yes.

4167. In giving that twenty, how would you allocate them? Would you give so many to Rothmines and so many to Pembridge!—I would give seven or eight to Rothmines, and seven or eight to Pembridge, and I would divide the others with the other townships.

4168. Would such a recommendation meet the views of the ratepayers?—No, not in Rothmines. I think the majority there would be against annexation, for

4155.
May 21, 1873.

Mr. MARK G.
BENTLEY.

BUREAU.
May 15, 1895.
Mr. Mark C.
Bentley.

they don't understand the question, and they have an impression it would cause the taxes.

4189. They think the Corporation receive taxes to the amount of about £6, on the property in the city, which is quite illogical, and that they only pay 2s. id. I—Quite so. In expressing my individual opinion, very likely that would be an unpopular opinion at present in Bathamere. When the question of Varty water was first started it was unpopular. I separated myself from my colleagues on the Board to raise the question. It is now popular, and, I believe, the majority of the ratepayers are in favour of the Varty.

4170. I think we know your view on the subject of the Varty water, and you have said enough about it, you add a little wisage that not only was it your own opinion, but that you were aware it was the opinion of others in Bathamere, that up to the present inquiry the Corporation was inadvertent?—Yes.

4171. Was that an element in your consideration of the question of amalgamation?—Undoubtedly.

4172. If you were satisfied that the Corporation have at present an estate which in the market at this moment ought to bring £600,000, and that their entire debt is only about £630,000, would that alter your views?—I believe now that the Corporation is perfectly solvent.

4173. And has that made a change in your views?—Undoubtedly. I also consider there is a great waste of governing power in having all these different bodies of Commissioners to govern the townships.

4174. Do you think there would be a saving in having one united body to administer the affairs of the several townships?—Undoubtedly it would save expense and preserve good feeling. You would have an effective fire brigade, an effective water supply, a saving of governing power, and an enormous saving in Parliamentary expenses. I wish to say a word about Grosvenor-square, which has been referred to here to-day: it is stated that it is not under the Board, and that is true; it is not a thoroughfare, and it was not giving up to the Board. One of the principal gentlemen who owns it—I believe it is owned by three or four—applied to the Board repeatedly to do something to the roadway, and the Board refused again and again, and rightly refused, because it was then said it had not been given up, that the Board had no power to take it up, and they refused to make any expenditure upon it. The residents in that square became greatly dissatisfied, and one of the principal owners there came forward as a reform candidate. He had my support at the time. He was elected. It was very rarely a gentleman was elected in opposition to the Board; but it so happened in this case it was accomplished, and this gentleman brought the matter before the Board again, when he became a Commissioner, and Mr. Stokes said it would be an injustice to Mr. Bentley, Mr. Murphy, and others to grant his request, because we had paid for our roads. I had paid several hundred pounds for my roads, and £10 or £20 for my lamps on Brighton-square, and Mr. Stokes appealed to me to answer this gentleman at the Board. I said I will not argue the question, but if it is done for Mr. Carey you ought to refund me what I have paid. After I left the Board it was to a certain extent granted.

4175. What do you mean by "to a certain extent"?—After the public audit I made an inquiry, at Mr. Carey's request, into the matter. One day coming down Leinster-road I observed the Commissioners' carts in Grosvenor-square doing what I was surprised at, and I made an inquiry from a member of the Board was there anything done in connection with Mr. Carey's request, and I was informed the Board had agreed to repair the roads, and that a sum of from £50 to £60 was to be spent on the roads. I think £60 was the sum—one-half to be contributed by the owners of Grosvenor-square, and the other half out of the rates. I brought this matter, which I considered an injustice to me and others who had not got the same terms, under the notice of the auditor, and he stated the expenditure by the Board was clearly illegal, and disallowed it.

The entry of the £25 or £30 was not in the name of Mr. Carey, who was then a Commissioner, but in that of another gentleman who was part owner of the place; and, finally, when the auditor made up his account, it appeared that there was an application made to the Local Government Board by those gentlemen, who had to pay the surcharge, and the Local Government Board did not press them. I addressed a letter to the Local Government Board, and if you have no objection I will show you the letter and reply. When I obtained the audit it was not from want of confidence in the Board, but I thought it would be very desirable for all parties, I had every confidence in the Board so far as regarded financial matters.

4176. The answer of the Local Government Board is that they don't see their way to revoking the surcharge, on the ground that it was illegal, but, under the circumstances, hoping the Board will be more cautious for the future, they will not insist on the surcharge?—Yes. I wish to say a word about Leinster-road; there are complaints about it; it is a so-called private road. I understand some thirty years ago the Board contracted with the owners of this road to keep the road in order for £25 a year, I think. A great many of the inhabitants complain that it is to a certain extent closed, and at the time of the inquiry before the auditor I asked for an inquiry into it, and I asked Mr. Evans to perceive the contract under which the Board entered into an arrangement to keep this private road in repair. I consider such a contract against public policy. I might as well go and make the roads of Brighton-square private roads. Mr. Evans refused, and I told him I wanted the contract to be read.

4177. As far as you know is that road repaired by the man and wife of the Commissioners?—It is, and I believe it takes between lighting and keeping it in repair over £100 a year, and yet I believe they get only £25 per cent.

4178. What authority is there for doing so—is it so, Mr. Evans?

Mr. Evans.—It is done by contract.

4179. Have you any authority for entering into such contracts?

Mr. Evans.—It was made in the year 1863.

4180. Mr. Horne, q.c.—Mr. Johnston said the reason he exercised no surveillance over it was that it was a private road.

Mr. Horne.—This is the contract for keeping it in repair (production contract).

4181. CHAIRMAN.—Will you show me any authority under any Act of Parliament for you becoming contractors for the repairing of private roads? Some one said complaints were made about Leinster-road and the sewage there, but Mr. Johnston said he could give no information about it as it was a private road? (Chairman reads contract between the acting contractor and trustee of the late Mr. Thomas Bell and the Commissioners of Bathamere, giving the Commissioners charge of portion of the Leinster-road to be kept in order by them for the sum of £10 a year.)

Mr. Evans.—I cannot; there was a former agreement for £30 a year, and this is one-third of that sum.

4182. Mr. Horne, q.c.—Why was it reduced?

Mr. Evans.—It was not reduced. Two-thirds of the road are under different proprietors, and the cost is divided.

4183. CHAIRMAN.—Was there any other agreement about this road?

Mr. Evans.—Yes; Sir John Gray and others paid £400, and it is to be returned whenever the Commissioners cannot maintain the road as a private road.

4184. CHAIRMAN.—Now the charge is only £10?

Mr. Evans.—And the capitalized sum of £400 paid to the Board.

4185. Mr. Horne.—That was taxing the future rates for the benefit of that year.

4186. Mr. Bentley.—They don't allow any heavy carts to go up the road nor funerals. An undue proportion of that traffic, therefore, goes round by other roads, and the ratepayers and occupiers complain of

DUNDEE
May 31, 1879
Mr. Mark C. Bentley.

the undue number of funerals passing their houses on the way to Mount Jerome Cemetery.

4187. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—Are there more agreements of this kind?

Mr. Evans.—No, not of any length; we often take up a road, and repair it; if we are asked to take up a new road and repair it before adopting it, we do so if the owner pays us.

4188. CHAIRMAN.—Who gave the order that no heavy traffic is to go that way?

Mr. Evans.—There is a notice up by the Commissioners.

4189. Do you finish the repairing before you take up a road?—No; we contract with the party for the repairing.

4190. Where is the authority of the Commissioners to repair any roads except township roads?—No, except it is by contract and agreement.

4191. You have no power to take up any road except a township road, and then it becomes a public road?—There is no question about that.

4192. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—Who put up the notice restricting the traffic?—The owners.

4193. Then it is a private road?—Yes.

4194. And it is repaired by you?—Yes; there is a provision in the agreement that whenever the Commissioners cannot retain it as a private road they are to lend back the £400.

4195. CHAIRMAN.—Show me anything in the Act of Parliament enabling any municipal body in Ireland to repair a private road?—They can if they are paid for it.

4196. Paid for it or not, they cannot do anything with the ratepayers' money except by the authority of the Act of Parliament?

4197. Mr. Bentley.—There is no authority, and I asked for the agreement to be produced, but it was refused.

4198. CHAIRMAN.—Where is the £400?

Mr. Evans.—It is lodged to the credit of the Commissioners, and it is part of the funds of the Board.

4199. Has it been expended?—No, it is part of the funds of the Board.

4200. It must have been spent long ago, for you are in debt long ago. Where would you get £400 to repay this if you required to repay it?—We would have to levy it.

4201. Where is there authority for doing that?—This matter was brought very fully before Mr. Collett, the auditor, and he passed the account without making a remark upon it.

4202. Mr. Bentley.—When I asked to have the contract produced and was refused, I could not discuss the subject before the auditor. Mr. Collett said he would take a note of it.

4203. Mr. Cotton.—Are there many other cases of the kind?—No, yearly cases, except one contract with the War Department for the repair of a lane at £10.

4204. Mr. Bentley.—There is an impression in the township, and, if it is incorrect it would be as well to ascertain the facts, that some members of the Board were the chief owners of Lettaster-road at that time. I believe Mr. Evans owns a house on it himself!

Mr. Evans.—I have a house on it; I am not aware of the owners; there are eight or nine owners.

4205. CHAIRMAN.—What does the repair of that road at present cost?—I don't know.

4206. Does it cost £100?—No.

4207. Does it cost £200?—Yes.

4208. Mr. Cotton.—It is more than half a mile long?—Yes, but it costs very little.

4209. CHAIRMAN.—Do you call it a township road or not?—It is a private road kept in repair by the Commissioners.

4210. Then by what authority do you call it a private road?—I can't tell.

4211. Mr. Bentley.—I could not discuss the matter before the auditor for my mouth was closed.

4212. CHAIRMAN.—But the auditor was shown a request that the Commissioners should take charge of

it as a township road, and after that it would be very hard to say it is a private road.

4213. Mr. Bentley.—If a funeral or heavy cart went up that way Mr. Evans or the police would prevent it. As to the £2, improvement rate under the 40th section of the Act of 1862, they were bound to set apart one-thirtieth of their income as a sinking fund, and that they never did until last year. Of course there was a saving on that account.

4214. CHAIRMAN.—They borrowed £50,000 under the Act of 1862—I think so, and by the 40th section of the Act of that year they were bound to set apart one-thirtieth of their income as a sinking fund, and that they never did until last year. Of course there was a saving on that account.

4215. In 1877 they set apart £666 13s. 4d. —Yes.

4216. Mr. Waller, Q.C.—The loan was not completed until 1867.

4217. CHAIRMAN.—When was the money last borrowed?

Mr. Evans.—In 1863.

4218. How much then?—£10,000.

4219. Did you ever set apart anything towards that?—Yes, at the earlier stages we did, but for three years we had to let it drop.

4220. As the rate was not sufficient?—Yes, and until the Act was passed enabling me to lay it as a sinking fund instead we could not do it.

4221. Mr. Bentley.—There was a secretary before Mr. Evans, and, whether rightly or wrongly, the ratepayers are under the impression he absconded with £2,000 of the ratepayers' money; to whose account was it charged?

Mr. Evans.—That was certainly not £2,000. It was a small matter.

4222. CHAIRMAN.—When was it?

Mr. Evans.—In 1862.

4223. Mr. Bentley.—I asked Mr. Hassard a question yesterday, but I had not his letter before me. I made a calculation, and I find the quantity of water which he requires would be required is, 1,000,000 (1 million) gallons daily, and that would cost about £60 in the pound on the valuation. I just make this observation because our ratepayers' committees consider 500,000 gallons daily would be sufficient for the township.

4224. Mr. Cotton.—What is the population of the township?—23,000. There is no audit or means by which we could learn how much the consumption was, but the Board maintain that the township consumes forty gallons per head per day, and that would take about 1,000,000 gallons, but the Fendrake township, with a larger population, and a wider area, doesn't reach 600,000, so I cannot understand it, and the position here of asking the Corporation to contract for 1,000,000 and a future 500,000 gallons extra is one very likely might not be received very favourably by the Corporation, however, Mr. Hassard reports in favor of dealing with the Corporation.

4225. CHAIRMAN.—You ceased to be a member of the Board in 1876?—Yes.

4226. CHAIRMAN.—However for two years at all events you were a member?—I was there eight years.

4227. You were then after 1874?—Yes.

4228. Did you ever appoint an executive sanitary officer, a sub-sanitary officer, and a consulting sanitary officer to the Board?—I don't recollect. Do you mean in my time?

4229. Yes?—No: I think Wright, whose name was mentioned before, was the only officer we had.

4230. Were the rules set forward by the Local Government Board ever brought to the attention of your Board as far as you know?—Never, as far as I know.

4231. Did you ever see your consulting sanitary officer before the Board?—No, unless Dr. Ward was consulting sanitary officer, or Mr. Evans.

4232. No; he must be a medical man?—I am not aware.

DUBLIN,
May 21, 1878.
Mr. Evans,

MR. EVANS, recalled.

4233. CHAIRMAN.—How is that? Mr. Evans!—I am executive sanitary officer.

4234. Who is consulting sanitary officer?—Dr. Ward was one.

4235. Who was the other?—Dr. Broome.

4236. Did he ever attend the Board?—Yes; Dr. Ward was a member of the Board, acting without salary, as consulting sanitary officer.

4237. And was he adopted by the Local Government Board?—Yes.

4238. You were under the impression there was no Public Health Act in force until 1874?—Oh, yes; the Sanitary Act.

4239. You got a copy of this book from the Local Government Board?—Yes.

4240. Did you read this, "The Public Health Act contains besides those which pertain to the public health," &c., "but the bulk of the enactments relating to water supply, removal of nuisances, and other matters are found in the Sanitary Acts of previous date to 1874"?—That is the Sanitary Act of 1866.

4241. Then, I understand under that Act you never did anything?—It had nothing to do with water.

4242. But had it not to do with infectious diseases and the sending of them to hospital, and the providing of a mortuary and disinfecting chamber?—Yes.

4243. And not one of these was done?—Yes; all except the disinfecting chamber and mortuary.

4244. Give me a single instance of a person labouring under infectious disease in which you availed yourself of the directions of the Act, and had that person removed for the safety of other persons to hospital?—The only case we had was a month ago, and we were set at defiance by the people, backed by the magistrates. Yesterday we were told there were a good many cases of infectious disease in a house which it would be well to have removed to hospital, but they would not go.

4245. You know the provision of the Public Health Act which says, that if a person suffering from infectious disease refuses to go to hospital, where they are in a house with others, the justices may make an order for the removal of that person. Is there an

instance in which you applied to a justice for such an order and he refused it?—No justice refused it, but we were set at defiance by the parties themselves.

4246. But the justice has authority to order the officer to take such a person in spite of the people?—In the case I refer to the police declined to act, and they said they had the orders of the Commissioners of Police not to act.

4247. Have you an hospital or place of reception for the sick in your district?—We have not.

4248. Then, the Act of Parliament could not be complied with?—I can't answer for that.

4249. Mr. Waller, Q.C.—The person must be a pauper.

4250. CHAIRMAN.—Not at all; but where there is more than one person residing in one room, and where there is not proper accommodation.

4251. MR. BEASLEY.—It is generally reported there were ten cases of small-pox in a lane in the township within the last three weeks.

4252. MR. EVANS.—That is so, and it is on account of the order being set at defiance.

4253. CHAIRMAN.—Isn't it strange Dr. Broome knew nothing about that?

MR. STEWART.—It is, for he signed the certificate for the removal of the man.

4254. CHAIRMAN.—He said there was no infectious disease in the locality.

MR. BEASLEY.—So I understood him to say.

4255. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any small-pox there?

MR. EVANS.—Yes; it all originated in our order being set at defiance.

4256. CHAIRMAN.—Isn't it because you have no hospital?

MR. EVANS.—We have the union, but the people set us at defiance, and the police when called upon said they had the directions of the Police Commissioners not to run the risk of contagion. In this case everything that could be done was done, and the Local Government Board acknowledged it.

4257. DR. NASHWOOD.—Were any reports sent in as regards Warwick-tonnes, Lissenden-park, since 1874?

MR. EVANS.—Not that I am aware of.

Mr. Mark
Beasley.

MR. BEASLEY, cross-examined.

4258. MR. WALLER, Q.C.—Do you think you are too race-coloured still for the Commissioners?—I am the same now as I have been all through.

4259. When were you first co-opted into this board?—About the year 1868.

4260. And you remained in it up to 1873?—I think up to 1876.

4261. Were you not twice in?—Yes.

4262. On what ticket did you address the election in 1873?—The board co-opted me.

4263. You continued up to 1873, and then there was an election. Have you the addresses on which you stood?—Yes; I have some of them. I have the address for 1876, but I do not think I have that for 1873; it was a board address—the usual address of the six candidates.

4264. Was it a joint address?—Yes.

4265. I suppose the one you issued was substantially the same as this one?—No; I don't think it was.

4266. What were the cardinal differences between the two?—The address in 1873, if there was one, was not prepared by me at all.

4267. But this one was?—It was.

4268. Then you were not elected in 1873; whatever your views were you were rejected?—Yes; I tried to get in with one or two reform candidates.

4269. And amongst them yourself?—I was a member of the board and I went out then with the other members, and I endeavoured to have Dr. Ward and Mr. Young elected as reform candidates; at all events the board knew I took up the case of the reform candidates, and they used their influence to keep me out.

4270. Did they not, as a matter of fact, so opt you in 1874?—Yes; they did.

4271. Notwithstanding that you had done so actively?—Yes.

4272. And you remained in until the next popular vote came?—Yes.

4273. And in 1876 you addressed the electors?—Yes.

4274. This address is by you and Mr. Hobson [reads address]?—Yes. That was my opinion then and up to my last address. I stated here to-day that until I heard the evidence before this Commission I was opposed to annexation.

4275. You were convinced by Mr. Pin and Mr. Beveridge?—Yes.

4276. And your opinions as to annexation are substantially the same as Mr. Pin's?—Yes.

4277. How often have you exposed yourself to the popular voice in Rathmines?—Twice or three times.

4278. And every time there was two to one against you?—I don't recollect. I knew the board was always against me.

4279. You talked of the standing of this Board as a matter of fact, don't you know there are also occupiers and twelve property holders amongst the twenty-one Commissioners?—No. I have not made a calculation, but I believe the main body are property owners. They govern the Board, it is called the Perpetual Cabinet in Rathmines. The Star Chamber Cabinet was the name it went by.

4280. It was not perpetual in your case?—Substantially it was, for if I went against the Board I would be thrown out.

DUNLOP,
May 21, 1873.
Mr. Mark G.
Bentley.

4281. In fact you have been carrying on rather a continuous war against the Board since 1873!—No; since 1876.

4282. Were you satisfied with the Board up to 1873!—No. I have never been satisfied with them.

4283. Have you been against them since 1873!—Yes, always against them.

4284. Can you tell me any occasion on which you were refused admission to the Board when not a member of it, in order to make any complaint?—I never applied. I would not expose myself to a refusal, I know very well I would not be admitted.

4285. Would you name any individual in Ruthinians dead or living, who was ever refused admission to the Board!—It is well known no one would be admitted.

4286. Could you name anyone who was refused!—No, because the Board has closed doors, and they would not allow in any one.

4287. You talked of a number of crossings not being granted. Do you not know there were crossings granted to Ruthinians Church!—I stated to-day there was one but we required two. I spoke of the portion of the church as you go up by Church-street approach.

4288. Do you think you have told everything that occurs to you against the Board!—I think so.

4289. How many wise men are there in Ruthinians along with you who don't understand the question of

amalgamation, and who if they understood it would be in favour of it!—I could not tell.

4290. Are you sure there is one besides yourself!—Yes, but I could not say how many, for I have not enquired the township on the question. When our deputations asked the Board to receive them, they wrote in reply that they were not in the habit of receiving deputations, but they as a matter of grace granted the interview. As regards what Mr. Walker endeavoured to make something out of—my address in 1876—I may say, I went out with a witness of the Board, we assembled in Mr. Hodgson's house in Chapel-street, and had a draft address prepared, and I said I would consent with the other members if they introduced the subject of the Varty water. I was authorised by Mr. Holmes who was coming up then also, to say that he wished a paragraph in the address asking for the Varty water, and a paragraph with regard to the surveyor.

4291. CHAIRMAN.—In the address you advocate everything, except amalgamation to the city!—I separated myself from my colleagues, on purpose in connexion with the Varty water, and had I remained with my colleagues I would have been elected.

4292. Why wasn't in 1876, you talked of amalgimating incorporation to the city!—It was discussed then in the township.

MR. JAMES MAGEE, EXAMINED.

4293. CHAIRMAN.—You live in Ruthinians!—I live at the head of Ruthin-road.

4294. You have a place of business in the city!—Yes; I don't wish to make a complaint, but I feel that the turning off of the water at night is a great grievance. I live in the centre of five roads; my house is on the highest point of the township, and every night at nine o'clock, the man turns off the water such as we have, leaving my house and premises without it. I have a very large store of hay, corn, whisky, sugar, wine, &c., there. I have tenanted houses also; I built five houses myself, and the house I live in, they are all in very great danger from fire every night, for we have not a part of water to put out a fire if one occurred. Immediately behind my place is the place of a man named Jenkins, cobbler for the township for many years, he has a large quantity of hay stored in lofts adjoining my premises, and there we are without a drop of water after half-past nine at night.

4295. How long is it cut off!—Until six in the morning. I heard some gentlemen say here we were satisfied with that, but I know my own neighbours are completely dissatisfied with it.

4296. Have you complained of it!—We have.

4297. What answer did you get!—No answer.

4298. Is it your opinion it would be desirable to have Ruthinians annexed to Dublin, provided there was proper representation for Ruthinians on the Dublin Corporation!—I have not given the matter consideration enough to form an opinion on it, and when asked I declined to send any answer to the question.

4299. In your opinion is the sanitary condition of Ruthinians in a proper state!—I can speak for my own locality more than for Ruthinians, for my place is distinct from Ruthinians to a certain extent. I have known houses on the Treasures road within the township, where the sewage runs back into the houses instead of going away, and they had to open and repair them, and I know they have cesspools.

4300. Are those houses up there with only cesspools to drain into!—Yes, they are using cesspools still behind the house, and I have repeatedly seen the sewage actually coming back into the house. I don't blame the Commissioners for this, as the county adjoins this place, and I believe the county is as much to blame. Mr. Evans may explain that. When I

was building my own premises, Mr. Evans will recollect we got a sewer made in Hodgar-avenue, and I carried it round to the front to drain my cellar, as the sewer on the main road is bad.

4301. Would that be remedied if Treasures was brought within the township!—Of course it would for the Commissioners would get clear of the Grand Jury. I have also to complain of a thing that occurred recently, a little child was killed at the gable end of my house; the child of some poor people living in one of my houses in the avenue, and there was an inquest held, at which I happened to be foreman of the jury, and we returned a verdict, that the accident was caused by the want of sufficient light in the avenue. We appealed that to the verdict, and it was conveyed to the Commissioners, but they would not give us a lamp, although we were decidedly of opinion that the want of it was the cause of the child's death.

4302. And is a lamp required!—It is; and Mr. Evans said there was a lamp committee sent and inspected the place, and decided they would not give it.

4303. Is all the rest of the township properly lighted as far as you know!—As far as I know, it is.

4304. As to the main thoroughfares and streets, including bye streets, kept in proper order!—I have no reason to complain of them at all; it is just my own immediate locality I can speak of.

4305. How far from this place where the accident occurred, is there a lamp!—It is quite too far entirely to be of the slightest service.

4306. Does the gas pipe go up to the spot!—It does; it passes there.

4307. And all they would have to do, would be to put up the lamp!—Yes.

4308. They would not have to lay any man!—No.

4309. When did the accident occur!—Within the last two or three months.

4310. Mr. Evans.—The lamp committee inspected the place, and found there were three lamps within fifty yards of each other, and there is no necessity for more.

4311. CHAIRMAN.—Unfortunately for them twelve juries on their oaths, came to the unanimous conclusion that there is.

4312. Mr. Evans.—There are lamps enough, but the projection of Mr. Magee's house prevents the light spreading; the master, however, is under consideration, this happened only two or three months ago.

Mr. James
Magee.

DUBLIN,
May 21, 1873.
Mr. Stephen N.
Elliington.

Mr. STEPHEN N. ELLINGTON, examined.

4313. CHAIRMAN.—Do you live in Rathmines—I do.
4314. Have you lived there long—I have been living there for upwards of twenty years, and in Rathmines-square for the last fifteen or sixteen years.

4315. Have you considered the question of annexation—I have, and I am of opinion annexation would be desirable, if there was proper and fair representation of principle, as well as house property.

4316. When you say principle, do you mean the owners as well as occupiers of houses—No; I mean that I think there is an element required at present (that is my own private opinion) in the Dublin Corporation, and I would wish that that element should be introduced into the Dublin Corporation, before Rathmines is annexed.

4317. But suppose the members of the Dublin Corporation were reduced to forty, and then that Rathmines and the other townships elected twenty members to the Corporation, what would you say to that—I heard that proposal to-day, and that does, certainly, meet with my concurrence, because I dare say, that would come near preserving equilibrium between the parties in the Corporation.

4318. And you would get in good men of business from the townships, who would stimulate the others to work well—Yes; I think it would conduce fairly to a settlement of these matters, and make people more amicable and better satisfied.

4319. Are you satisfied with the way the Commissioners have managed the sanitary matters—I am not satisfied. There is one matter about which I am very much dissatisfied, and that is the provision in case of fire. I think that is below contempt, and I think it is a delusion, a mockery, and a snare, to have such a wretched engine as they have in Rathmines. I think local provision to meet emergencies in the localities is the best mode, for in the case of fire, time is essential. On two occasions I have witnessed fires in the neighbourhood, and especially on one occasion in November last, at a fire in Gresham's Cross at night, I saw the wretched condition of things. I heard, and I believe it is perfectly true, that there was some misunderstanding between Captain Ingram and the Commissioners in Rathmines, which rendered it impossible for him to come out to attend fires in the township—there was some miserable quibbling about money matters, and I felt it was not a state of things that should be allowed to continue. Entertaining this opinion very strongly, I acceded to a request to offer myself as a candidate for a Commissionership, and I got a large number of votes on the principles I advocated—Vandy water, and proper provision against fire.

4320. Can you say there is a feeling amongst any considerable number of ratepayers in Rathmines in favour of the Vandy water, and against the present system—I think there is a very considerable feeling on the subject of the Vandy water, and if a house-to-house survey was permitted, the question could have been settled, and a most accurate estimate formed as to the feeling in the township.

4321. Was that refused—Yes, it was distinctly refused by the Board.

4322. To your own knowledge—Yes.

4323. That is, in other words, a memorial was sent forward, asking for a house to house visit—Yes; and they would not allow it.

4324. I don't mean every inhabitant, but only the ratepayers—Yes.

4325. A deputation was also sent to the Board—Yes; and there was one fact connected with that transaction which I did not at all like. We came before the Board to argue with them and to state our views. I was silent, but many of the other gentlemen spoke, and not only did the Commissioners say nothing in reply, but Mr. Stokes was perfectly silent also, and merely handed us an answer to a discussion which had just taken place, instead of answering what had been said. I thought it was a very peculiar proceeding to have an answer ready to a discussion which had only just taken place.

4326. And the answer was that they would not do as you asked—I—Yes; we were politely bowed out, and were rather disconcerted that there was not a single reply.

4327. Mr. Heron, q.c.—They wrote out their judgment before they heard you—Exactly so; judgment was delivered before counsel was heard.

4328. CHAIRMAN.—Are you satisfied with the sanitary condition of the township, and the way it is scavenged—Well, indeed, I have picked up a good deal of mud occasionally; but I did not particularly mind it. I do, however, mind good water, and protection for life and property.

4329. Were you aware the water was completely turned off from a very large portion of the township at night—I heard it, but I don't remember that I was so unfortunate as to be affected by that.

4330. You are not affected by it—No.

Cross-examined by Mr. Andreas, q.c.

4331. What is the principle you would desire to have introduced into the Corporation, and the municipal government of Rathmines—I would have a more rational and conservative principle infused, and less radicalism.

4332. And that is a *susceptible* for municipal organisation—I should not wish, myself, to join the body unless their principles and their mode of action towards every party were modified and altered.

4333. And you think that that change is badly wanted in the Dublin Corporation—I do, indeed.

4334. And until that is rectified you would have nothing to say to it—Certainly not; nothing whatever.

4335. You were a candidate yourself for a Commissionership—I—Yes.

4336. And one of the things you advocated was the introduction of the Vandy water—I—Yes.

4337. And that was made a prominent matter at your election—I—Yes.

4338. And the electors did not think proper to return you—I—No; but I got 200 votes.

Mr. SAMUEL GRIFFIN, examined.

4339. CHAIRMAN.—You live in Rathmines—I do. I am a ratepayer, and owner of property in the township. I live by it.

4340. Have you considered this question of annexation to the city—I have; and I would be very sorry to see annexation accomplished.

4341. On what grounds—I consider taxation would be very much increased in Rathmines without benefiting the Dublin people very much.

4342. Suppose taxation would not be increased—I would very much prefer being left with the present Commissioners, who, as far as I know them for some years, have attended to the wants of the township.

4343. Are you of opinion their action with regard to the Vandy water is right—Perfectly right.

4344. You are perfectly satisfied—I—Perfectly; and I have the testimony of many others who are water drinkers, and who can pass a very good judgment on the water. I saw a great deal made about this matter by Mr. Bentley and others, but in the interest of decent gentlemen, I would be very sorry to see the present water taken from them, and to see them obliged to drink Vandy.

4345. Have you heard that a deputation of ratepayers waited on the Board, and asked them to ac-

tain by circular, or otherwise, whether the people were in favour of the Varty or not?—Yes.

4348. And that the Board declined?—Yes; I hear that stated now.

4347. Do you think that course, with regard to a large deputation, was right?—I think that requires explanation, and perhaps the Commissioners could explain it.

4348. But there is no explanation up to the present?—The inference I draw from the Commissioners' statement is, that they entertained the question of the Varty, and made a proposal to the Corporation about it.

4349. In what part of the township is your property?—Mount Pleasant-square, and Bonelagh-road, and Mount Pleasant-avenue.

4350. What would you think of having the water turned off at nine o'clock at night?—I suppose I would not like that. As far as I can learn from inquiries at the office, they are contemplating taking the water from a higher level, which will give a much higher pressure.

4351. But I am speaking of what is done every night now?—You must take into consideration the fact that a great number of houses have been built along the line of supply, and the quantity of water required has been growing rapidly.

4352. Mr. Magee says the practice has been going on for a long time, and that he has made complaints, and gone to the office about it without success. What would happen there if a fire occurred?—There is plenty of water in the canal.

4353. How far is the canal from that?—The water is very easily brought from it. The Commissioners are contemplating that state of things, and their intention is to bring the water with full force on the upper part of Rathmines.

4354. You heard Mr. Bentley examined, and you heard him refer to three hoses of which he had made written complaints, so far back as the 4th February, 1878, and in which references were allowed to remain until the 6th May, in this year. Is that right?—It is a bad state of things, if such a state of things exists; but if it is for the purpose of cleanliness you want to be annexed to the city, I will bring you to houses and alleys in the city which are disgraceful.

4355. The sanitary condition of which is so bad that the Government are about to have an inquiry on the subject. Do you think Rathmines contributes at all to that state of things?—I don't think it does.

4356. Is it a fact that the artisan population who build the houses in Rathmines and Penrhos live in the city almost to a man?—A great number of them live in the suburbs—in Harold's Cross, and in the avenues in Rathmines.

DUBLIN,
May 21, 1879.
Mr. Samuel
Griffen.

4357. A considerable number!—A considerable number must, for there are avenues with small houses.

4358. Are you able to say that of your own knowledge?—I will say that certainly the labouring classes who are employed in Rathmines principally live in Rathmines.

4359. Do you think the artisan classes—masons, carpenters, and bricklayers who have helped to build the houses in Rathmines live in Rathmines?—I think a great number of the parties who are employed in Rathmines live in Rathmines, Harold's Cross, Ballybough, and such places.

4360. Then your opinion is there is a large portion of the labouring and artisan classes living in your township?—Yes.

4361. Is there any hospital to send them to when sick?—If there is not certainly Rathmines people subscribe to support other hospitals.

4362. If there is an hospital within the township the Rathmines authorities can compel people to go to it. Is there such a place?—I always understood, I don't know whether it is law or not, that any person suffering from infectious disease could be removed.

4363. Where to—unless there is an hospital within the district?—There is one very fortunate circumstance connected with Rathmines—it is exceedingly healthy.

4364. That has been attributed to the fact that there is a better class of people living there?—I think it arises from the care taken of the sanitary arrangements of the township, and the plentiful supply of water.

4365. Mr. Heron, q.d.—And the wholesome nature of it?—Yes.

4366. CHAIRMAN.—Have you heard that the reason the water is cut off is the want of water?—That is only at one point.

4367. Is it your opinion there is plentiful pressure in the township?—Yes.

4368. Then you disagree with Mr. Johnston and others?—Yes; that is as far as my property is concerned, and as to the quality of the water I think it has been decided by Dr. Cameron that it is far more wholesome than Varty water.

4369. He does not say that?—He goes very nearly to that.

4370. Mr. Heron, q.d.—You think it is as wholesome as the Varty?—I do.

4371. CHAIRMAN.—Then, if the taxation was lessened, you would still rather stay as you are?—I would prefer it infinitely, except it was something tremendous. I suppose the object of this inquiry is either to benefit Rathmines or Dublin.

4372. Mr. Heron, q.d.—It may benefit both or injure both?—That is the question.

Mr. Charles H.
Hanson.

MR. CHARLES HENRY HANLON, examined.

4373. CHAIRMAN.—You live in Rathmines?—I do. I have lived there for fifty years. I have no house property except my own house.

4374. Have you considered the question, whether it would be desirable to annex Rathmines to Dublin?—I have. I think it would be highly desirable.

4375. Why do you think so?—My chief reason is, I think there is a total want of water. I concur with every gentleman that spoke here in favour of the Varty water. I live myself in 71 Frankfort-avenue. Three or four years ago a lady's house took fire within two or three doors of me. My neighbours and myself had considerable trouble with the fire, and we nearly put it out before the hose came up from the township, and it was quite ineffectual.

4376. How long was the place on fire before the hose came up?—It was a couple of hours. We nearly had the fire out when it came up, and then it did more harm than good, for the water came out at the wrong end of it. I am perfectly certain the body lost more by that hose than otherwise.

4377. You mean the hose was leaking?—Yes; the water came out everywhere but where it should.

4378. We heard that the hose was always kept beautifully oiled, and ready for use?—The officers would be better able to answer as to that, but my personal knowledge is what I tell you.

4379. You saw that yourself that night?—Upon my word I did; I was wet myself; I was drowned with it.

4380. What about the sanitary condition of Rathmines?—I was speaking to one of the ratepayers, who lives at Zion Church, and the houses there all have cesspools. There is not one sewer there.

4381. Are they not close to the main road?—There is no main sewer there.

4382. Mr. Heron.—That is so, and that is a district to be provided by the main drainage scheme.

Hanson.—They are very old houses.

4383. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Johnston said there were no cesspools.

BERLIN.
May 21, 1878.
Mr Charles H.
Hanson.

4384. Mr. Evans.—Zion terrace is a very old terrace, in which there was no provision for drainage.

4385. CHAIRMAN.—Who looks after it?

Mr. Evans.—The sanitary officer is continually there to see they are kept in order.

4386. Witness.—At Kenilworth terrace there is a lane that is made the constant receptacle for every kind of cabbage, filth, and refuse. There is one heap of refuse I have been watching for two or three months, and it is now nearly halved down.

4387. In the lane a nuisance!—It is a great nuisance. I am ashamed of it when my daughters pass by.

4388. Is it in a populous district?—It is one of the most populous districts.

4389. Did you ever see Mr. Johnston there?—I saw him one day measuring a dead wall, and I said "I hope you are going to do something for our footpath." At my gate the asphalt commences, and from that down to the corner there is no kerbstone, and it is neglected, and no part of the country could be worse than that. When I asked Mr. Johnston what he was going to do something with our footpath, he said "I suppose so," but the place is there still worse than ever. I am obliged to cross from my house to the opposite house through the dirt in order to avoid this to-way. I am told it is not asphalted, because there is no kerbstone.

4390. How long is it since Mr. Johnston said it would be done at once?—It is many, many months.

4391. What kind of lane is that you complain of?—It is tolerably wide and extremely exposed; it runs at the back of my house, and runs into Harold's-cross.

4392. And how long is it in that condition?—Since I know the lane.

4393. How long is that?—Before it was made.

4394. Is it made ten years, or all events?—It is.

4395. Did you ever point that out to Mr. Johnston?—No.

4396. Is that close to where he was measuring the wall?—It is just beside it.

4397. He says there is not a lane in that condition

in the township!—Why there is a heap of refuse there, and it is most offensive.

4398. Do you know the Sub-sanitary Officer?—I do since he was a boy.

4399. Did you ever see him looking after that lane?—No; what would he do with it.

4400. Did you ever see the head-sergeant looking after it?—I would not know him.

4401. Did you ever see any one looking after it?—Not at all; it is a most neglected lane, and it is in one of the most respectable parts of the township.

4402. Are there any other localities not so close that you can speak of?—No, except those lanes Mr. Bentley speaks of.

4403. Do you know them?—Yes.

4404. Are they in the condition he describes?—Yes, they are very bad, and there is little traffic through them.

4405. Are they a nuisance?—They are.

4406. With regard to the township are the streets swept properly?—I think they are, inasmuch as the teammen have added to the township very much by keeping the place in order.

4407. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—Is this lane on Mr. Murphy's property?—I think Mr. Murphy owns all that property around there; he also owns Elms-road.

4408. Mr. Evans.—Mr. Stokes owns the ground.

4409. Dr. Novello.—Mr. Murphy's is opposite that, and that is the place that is only enclosed by Parks.

Witness.—It is as plain as two and two make four; we would not be called upon to pay more tax, and that we would be benefited by being annexed to Dublin.

4410. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—It would be £1. 7d. more in the pound!—That is not much.

4411. You said you would not be under any more taxes?—No more of any consequence.

4412. You and Mr. Bentley inspected those lanes?—No; I went with him to inspect the lane at the back of his house; he showed it to me, and I did not know there was such a lane at all in the place it is such a by-place, and I had to see it from his room.

Mr. Evans recalled.

4413. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know these lanes he speaks of?—I do not; we have cases where if a lane was cleaned out to-day it would be filthy again to-morrow, but I will have it inquired into; he never complained of it.

4414. Mr. S. H. Bower.—I am a Commissioner of Rathmines. I beg to contradict most emphatically the statement made by Mr. Bentley that the Board refused to receive deputations; I have insisted on receiving gentlemen at the Board myself.

4415. Mr. Bentley.—I would ask Mr. Evans to produce the letter to the Secretary of our Ratepayers' Committee, in which it is stated that the Board are not in the habit of receiving delegations, but at the same time agreeing to receive us.

4416. Mr. Bower.—We were not in the habit, but at the same time we received you.

The Commissioners then adjourned until next morning.

DUBLIN—TENTH DAY—MAY 22ND, 1879.

DUBLIN
May 22, 1879.
Mr. Mark
Bentley.

4417. Mr. Mark Bentley.—In connexion with my evidence, I wish to make a statement. I stated that there was a rule of the Board of the Bathmores Commissioners against receiving depoitations. I was contradicted by Mr. Bolton, but I have in my hand the book of minutes of the ratepayers committee containing a letter from Mr. Evans, which I think settles the point. In that letter he states it is the rule of the Board and that it is only as a matter of grace we were received. I asked Mr. Evans to bring that, and he said it would take too long to search for it. The letter is dated 22nd December, and states—

“DEAR SIR.—Although it is contrary to the rule of the Board to receive depositions, I submitted your letter of the 19th instant to the Chairman, and he requested me to say he will receive your deposition at the Board at 10 o'clock.

“J. H. EVANS, Secretary.”

I see Mr. Johnston is here and I wish to say that I understand there is no sewer in Orwell-road. Mr. Johnston can be asked the question.

4418. CHAIRMAN.—Can you say, Mr. Johnston, is it the case that there is no sewer in Orwell-road?—No, not in Zion-road.

4419. Mr. Bentley.—It has been promised by the Commissioners for many years, and the drainage is very bad. Has Bagnell ever taken any sewer?—No, it has a private sewer at the rear, running down into the river.

4420. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Bentley says the Commissioners promised over and over again to construct a sewer at Orwell-road?—There is a plan in preparation for the purpose of providing it.

4421. Mr. Heron.—How many years is it since the Commissioners were first asked for a sewer?—As long as I remember—four or five years ago, any way.

4422. Mr. Bentley.—Another matter is this. There is no sewer, I believe, at portions of Grosvenor-road—Mr. Bagnell desired me to state that for him, as he is detained close here. There is no main sewer, and he is absolutely unable to have a closet in his house!—There is a sewer at Grosvenor-crescent.

4423. Mr. Heron.—Whose property is that, Mr. Johnston?—Mr. Drummond's.

4424. CHAIRMAN.—Is this Grosvenor-road in charge of the Commissioners?—Yes.

4425. Why has not a sewer been made there?—There is one into which Mr. Bagnell drains.

4426. Mr. Bentley.—Mr. Bagnell says there is no such sewer.

4427. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Bentley says he was requested to make this statement, as Mr. Bagnell himself was unable to attend.

Mr. Johnston.—There are two houses opposite, and Mr. Bagnell's house is drained in the sewer there.

4428. CHAIRMAN.—I understand you to say yesterday that no drain was allowed to accumulate for any length of time?—Yes, Mr. Hanlon stated yesterday evening that there was an accumulation to the existence of which he himself pointed out to you, as you happened to be near at hand at the time measuring some wall. There was a quantity of vegetable and other refuse thrown in the place, and he showed it to you and you promised to have it attended to, but from that day to the present it has not been done. I suppose that is the lane Mr. Bentley alluded to beyond his own house?

Mr. Bentley.—No.

4429. Mr. Johnston.—Well, then, there must be some mistake about it. People, however, will throw out refuse.

4430. But he says it was so for a considerable time. He says he was sick making complaints to the Commissioners, and that seeing you there at the time he thought it would be attended to. He says further, that you admitted the nuisance was a bad one, but that from that day to this nothing has been done and

that was three months ago!—There is a staff of men going about doing nothing else but attending to these things.

4431. He says he never saw the sub-servient officer in his life there!—The sub-servient officer is here.

4432. Mr. Bentley has stated that he made a complaint to you and that for two years nothing was done!—Yes; I saw his letter. I know that builders were building a lot of houses where Mr. Bentley spoke of, and I found a quantity of bricks and mortar left there. I went to the builder and asked him would he be kind enough to have the stuff removed.

4433. But here is a ratepayer saying that on the fourth of February there was an actual nuisance existing and complaining of it, and on the fifth of May following it still remained there.

4434. Mr. Bentley.—I believe the building Mr. Johnston speaks of was only temporary. That is in our lane-way, but there are two lane-ways where I speak of. Now, I wish to mention, as Mr. Johnston is here, that the footpaths on both sides of the road where I reside are exceedingly bad and dangerous to those who may have to pass from my house to the Rutgar-road. I fell there last winter in the dark.

4435. Mr. Johnston.—You know I have nothing to do with the lamps; I have nothing to say to the placing of them.

4436. Mr. Bentley.—No; but as Mr. Johnston was here I wished to mention the state of those footways, and he can correct me if I am not right.

4437. CHAIRMAN.—It was stated (I think by Mr. Migeo) that there was at Zion-terrace a disgraceful nuisance which was left there and not carried away, and that there was no sewer nor cesspool and that the place was a perfect disgrace.

4438. Mr. Johnston.—I said in my evidence that I could only speak of roads under my charge; that road is not under my charge, and I know nothing about it.

4439. Why is it not under your charge? Is not Leinster-road under your charge?—Yes; but it is paid for by the inhabitants.

4440. But if it is a township road, why don't you open the gate, and exercise control over it?—I have nothing to do with it.

4441. Dr. Newwood.—Is there any distinguishing public and private roads? Suppose the Commissioners wished to know if a given road was private or not, is there any indication on the map to show that?—No, except what I point out to them.

4442. Mr. Bentley.—I asked the Commissioners how it was the pathways are not curbed; I believe the Board has power to compel them to be curbed.

4443. Mr. Johnston.—You know the rule of the Board is that there shall be no curbing on the pathways, unless the proprietors or landlords contribute.

4444. CHAIRMAN.—Where is the law that the Commissioners are not to curb footways unless the owners contribute? It may be the rule of the Bathmores Board, but where is the law for it?—That is the rule laid down to me.

4445. I know that—so you say, but where is the law for such a thing? Mr. Migeo says the sidewalk opposite his place has no support, and is altogether in a disgraceful state!—Opposite his house is asphalted, and the rest of it will be done.

4446. Mr. Corcoran.—Can you let us know the annual cost of the maintenance of Leinster-road?—It goes into the general account, and it would be hard to say.

4447. Is it created by the £30 a year paid to the Commissioners for it?—Yes.

4448. CHAIRMAN.—Does it cost more than £10?—It does.

4449. Mr. Bentley.—There is more spent on it in proportion than there is on any place else!—No, there is not.

4450. Mr. Bentley.—My tenants at Brighton-square complain constantly of the system of turning off the

DUBLIN,
May 22, 1850.
Mr. Mark
Bentley,

water at night, also of the quantity and "hardness" of the water. Many of them complain very bitterly of those things.

4451. CHAIRMAN.—Is it turned off in this way, Mr. Johnston?—It is.

4452. Are you aware that it is turned off?—Yes; it could not be without my knowledge and instructions.

4453. Mr. Hanlon told us that a fire occurred near his own house, and that two hours elapsed before the hose was brought, and when it did come it was useless, as the water was bursting out from every part of it except the right place!—He must be mistaken; the hose is perfectly good. It was made by Mr. Box of Abbey-street.

4454. Mr. Besley.—As Mr. Evans is now here, I may say he was present when Mr. Bolton contended me as to the question of the rule of the Board not to receive deputations. He said there was no rule of the Board about receiving deputations. Now Mr. Evans is here, and no doubt he remembers sending me the letter which I have read?

Mr. Heron.—There was an old rule of the Board not to receive deputations; it was relaxed, and when the object of the deputation is known, it has been relaxed in every case.

4455. Mr. Heron, &c.—What is the date of the rule to receive no deputations?—It was very early, I should say in the year 1830. It was before Mr. Bolton joined the Board.

Dr. Edward
Hamilton

Dr. EDWARD HAMILTON, of Stephen's Green, examined.

4456. I have property to the value of £10,000 sunk in the district of Rathmines, and that sum was sunk there on the faith of the Act of Parliament, by which we thought we were perfectly free from the control of the Corporation for ever. If we had any other view, I would not have sunk my property in it.

4457. CHAIRMAN.—Suppose the taxation was no higher, would you still object?—Yes, I would.

4458. Even with proper representation?—Yes, I would rather remain as I am.

4459. Are you satisfied with the water supply of Rathmines?—There are no complaints about it, except with reference to its hardness.

4460. Are you aware that in the upper district—in Rathgar—is it turned off for nine hours of the night?—Yes, in certain districts.

4461. And surely you do not think that is a state of things that ought to exist; what would be done in the case of a fire?—Well, that may be, but I have heard no complaints of that as a landlord.

4462. Are you satisfied with the sanitary condition of Rathmines?—Yes, I am.

4463. We have heard it stated that the Commissioners would not give a crossing to a church; are you aware that that is so?—No; I may say that I do not consider the administration of the Commissioners perfect, nor do I consider the administration of the Dublin Corporation perfect. I think, on the contrary, that you will find imperfections in both, and probably we would not be much better off under the Corporation.

4464. As to sinking property on the faith of the township continuing as it was constituted, you are aware, doctor, that the legislature has interfered already with vested rights. You know the bridge-tax has been imposed!—Quite so.

4465. Well, now, is it your opinion that the people of Rathmines should contribute anything towards keeping up the streets of Dublin, paving and lighting them?—I don't see on what principle they should.

4466. Don't they use them?—Yes; but in using them, don't they come and spend money in the city; don't they purchase the merchandise of the city, and I wonder what would the shopkeepers say if you prevented Rathmines people coming in. You use our roads in great numbers; and, in fact, I should be inclined to say that the accommodation is mutual.

4467. Now, take cattle. I suppose every beast slaughtered in Rathmines is brought to the city—and do they not cause a great amount of filth, dirt and injury to the streets—and what advantage do the citizens of Dublin derive from that?—Well, it strikes me that causes very little addition—a very small proportion—to the labour of scavenging.

4468. Does it not do some harm?—Oh, yes; and do not the cattle in the same way injure our streets coming through the township to the city? They pass through from the southern districts, and I should be inclined to put one as an equivalent to the other.

4469. Mr. Walker.—Are you aware that most of the cattle are brought out dead from the city?—I am speaking now of cattle coming through the township to the city from the country.

4470. CHAIRMAN.—Do they not bring their cattle from Rathmines to the city to move their supply of dead meat, and don't you throw immense expense on the city to look after the slaughter-houses, and keep them in order, so that they may have these cattle slaughtered for your benefit?—Many are slaughtered in the township for the benefit of the township.

4471. Are you, as a medical man, satisfied with this?—that in Rathmines and in Rathgar there is not any hospital or place to which you can compel a person to be taken under the Public Health Act of last year?—The Mount Hospital is exceedingly close to them. The Act says, any convenient hospital, whether in the district or not.

4472. Should the Rathmines people have all the advantages of the city, and not pay a penny of taxation—should the solicitors, merchants, and others, having chambers and establishments here go off and live in Rathmines without contributing one farthing to the city which they use so much?—Well, as to that, I can only say that if you bring in the townships you will send the people off to the districts beyond, and you will ruin the townships. They will go out to Rathmines, and the township will be ruined. These, of course, are matters of opinion.

4473. Is it to get out of the city taxation?—I don't think that so much.

4474. It was stated that most of the landlords let houses in this way—they pay the rates?—Yes; as a matter of safety.

4475. These landlords have a most direct interest in keeping the rates as low as possible?—Yes.

4476. And in a great many instances those landlords do not live in Rathmines?—Yes; but the landlords must see that their tenants are comfortable, otherwise they will lose their tenants.

4477. Mr. Heron.—Do you think the horses would become uncomfortable if the Corporation had the management of them?—I do.

4478. CHAIRMAN.—It is clear the doctor does not like their management?—No; I have to go through a great deal of the more private parts of the city.

4479. Mr. Walker.—We know, doctor, you have a large medical practice?—Yes.

4480. And you are well acquainted with all parts of the city and its lanes and by-streets?—Yes.

4481. Can you draw any comparison between the roads of Rathmines and the streets of Dublin?—There is no comparison at all.

4482. Are not the streets of Dublin in a filthy state as to scavenging?—Yes; filthy.

4483. And in a state positively injurious to health?—Yes; I have seen organic matter festering in the streets myself for weeks without being removed.

MR. LAUNCELOT STAFFORD, M.P., examined.

4484. CHAIRMAN.—You live in Rathgar!—Yes; for twenty-five years.

4485. I believe you have been acting on what is called the ratpayers' committee!—Yes; allow me to say that I am neither for nor against annexation at present advised; my experience does not lead me to wish to go under the Corporation, or stay under the Commissioners, if I could do better.

4486. You have not any special regard for either!—No. I received this circular from Mr. Evans, and was not prepared to say whether I was for or against annexation. The reason is this: I know something rather to the discredit of the Corporation as well as the Commissioners. Having studied chemistry I am rather competent to give an opinion as to the water question; indeed I made it a particular study, and for particular reasons. I read a paper before the Royal Irish Academy about two years ago at their request, and Dr. Stokes was in the chair. He was an eminent sanitary authority, and one who had given his attention to sanitary matters in Dublin, especially. I examined, and in that paper gave the results of the examination, the stagnant or gutter waters that run in gutters and sometimes stay there. I examined them in twenty-zinc glasses (not all confined to posh places). I examined three squares—Fitzwilliam-square, Merrion-square, and Stephen's-green. I examined several streets, and went down to the very lowest—close to the Liffey. The result was that I found that organic matter was left to settle there in the sun, which generated very bad gases, and displayed organic impurity certainly one hundred-fold worse than even the worst specimens of the Liffey. I am telling why I am not altogether in favour of annexation, and it is for this reason, if we do per adventure become annexed, and if they take as bad care of our roads and lanes as they do of their own, it would be a very unfortunate conclusion to arrive at.

4487. But suppose they improve!—First of all, do you think your own lanes are properly kept!—Well, I don't go into the lanes, and I have not much to complain of as to our roads. There are certainly dirty pathways in it; but I would not say such impurities in our gutter waters.

4488. I have no doubt there is not. They are much dirtier in Dublin than in Rathmines. Even Dr. Novak would not deny that. Fitzwilliam-square was the third worst in Dublin.

4489. And Lively was one of the most unhealthy. Now, take it, Dr. Sandford, that both parties are willing to improve—and this is said to be the age of improvements—and that the Dublin Corporation becomes better, what would be your view!—I am altogether for the Vartry water. I think it a very soft water. It is eight times as soft as the canal, and it is much more pure and much higher, and better authorities than I am are of that opinion. If the Commissioners would give us the Vartry water, and of course a fire brigade, which is an absolute essential for our fire, I would certainly like to stay as I am. But if they do not, and if they persevere as they have over and over again to give us the water they have done, I would, at all hazards, go under the Corporation.

4490. You mean your own Commissioners have persevered!—Yes. We endeavoured to get the Vartry. The committee, to which I think you already alluded, was formed. I was made chairman because they knew that I knew something about this canal water, and though I have no property there, relatives of mine have, though I do not say they have my opinions—and I would be glad to see their property benefited. Our first duty was to see what terms we could get from the Corporation. They certainly met us very graciously, and offered very eligible terms indeed, and would give us a daily supply of twenty-two gallons for every man, woman, and child, in-the-towship, at a percentage rate of about 5d. on the valuation, which would be 1,000 gallons for 2s 4d. The Commissioners granted us an interview, and there were eminent men who spoke on that occasion—gentlemen interested in the question. Professor Galloway gave us his opinion on the chemical point of view. Mr. Shire, the clergyman, and Mr. Bentley were there and stated their views. I should, however, mention, that when we came in, the chairman put into our hands some printed paper which professed to be an answer to what he had before sent in to him. Mr. Bentley during the discussion ventured to suggest to the chairman that they should have a house-to-house canvass as to the feeling for the Vartry or canal amongst the ratpayers; the chairman did not make any observations on that; he did not appear to consult his colleagues, and after about twenty minutes, when we were about to withdraw, I thought it right to remind the chairman of the offer Mr. Bentley had made, and to ask him was he in a position to give a distinct reply. Well, he did not turn round in his chair; he did not even look at one of his colleagues, and the only answer we could get was the paper put in our hands, which, of course, did not touch on the question at all. If they had been as free then as they are now, it would have been better. They invite us now to a house-to-house canvass about annexation. If they had acceded to the suggested house-to-house canvass on the merits of the Vartry and canal water, it would have saved a good deal of difficulty.

4491. Do you think the majority of the ratpayers are in favour of the Vartry!—Yes, every one that I spoke to is. I do not myself use either waters. I happen to have a very good pump, and am indebted to the skins for water for washing purposes, so that I am particularly disinterested in the question.

4492. If there was a sea pool near your pump you might find the difference!—There is none on my road.

4493. You are not satisfied about the fire brigade!—No I am not, I would be glad to have the fire brigade, but, as I said before, my great object is the Vartry water. If I don't get the Vartry water from the Commissioners, I would go under the Corporation, but if I do get the Vartry water and the fire brigade I would stay as I am.

4494. But you will have your taxation increased!—If I must, I must.

4495. Do you object to it!—No.

4496. You will pay for it!—It is very well worth paying for. It will be very good value.

MR. THOMAS MAYNE, T.C., examined.

4497. CHAIRMAN.—Have you considered this question of annexation to Dublin!—Well, I can't say that I have, sir; I have come forward merely because I read in the paper the evidence of the witnesses given yesterday, and the day before I have been reading statements there as to the admirable roads of Rathmines, and the excellent way in which they are kept, and the beautiful quality of the water, and, as a resident, I must certainly concur with both statements.

4498. Where is your house!—5, Williams' Park.

4499. Is that one of the places in charge of the Commissioners, or is it private property!—It is Mr.

BURGESS,
May 22, 1879
Mr. Launcelot
Stafford, M.P.

Murphy's estate. I purchased the house from Mr. Murphy; it is just off the main road. Between my house and Portobello bridge there is only one crossing, and that is opposite the Roman Catholic chapel, and it is quite out of order, and is never swept except when the road is scavenged, which is about twice a week at present (it was not done so often until lately). The pathway is never swept when the road is scavenged, and never on Sundays. In March last it was all but impossible; you would have to wade over the road.

4500. Is that at the place which some gentlemen

Mr. Thomas
Mayne, T.C.

BROOK,
May 21, 1879.
Mr. Thomas
Mayne, T.C.

described as being so bad that he was obliged to take up his children in his arms in order to cross from one side to the other!—I am not sure; I removed into the Bathmains township from Blackrock about the 1st of March.

4501. Can you speak as to any other of the roads?—I can say that none of the roads are kept as well as they ought to be for a township claiming to be well managed; in fact, I consider the administration to be undoubtedly bad.

4502. Are the footpaths scavenged every day?—They are not scavenged at all. I only knew of its being touched once, and in one place, and that was at the car-stand, between Willans' Park and Portobello-bridge opposite Richmond-hill, where an accumulation of hay and dust had gathered in wintry weather. I have no known it to be swept elsewhere.

4503. Is there a public car-stand there, and is it not swept every day?—No, it is not. It is swept as well as the rest about twice a week. It is better now than it used to be. I lived in Bathmains for a considerable period, about eight years ago, when the trams were begun to be made, and at that time I considered, and so did a great many other people, that it was a great mercy the tram people did lay the line. At that time the road was not scavenged as often even as twice a week. I have known that road to be six inches deep with mud almost constantly. I kept a horse and trap, and I had frequently to walk my horse to Portobello-hill.

4504. Was that the main road?—Yes.

4505. Do you say of your own knowledge that the road has not been scavenged more than twice a week since March?—Not longer.

4506. Even where the car-stands are?—Yes.

4507. Do you say that the footpaths are not scavenged at all?—Yes; not at all, except at the car-stand opposite Richmond-hill, which is an important thoroughfare. There is not any crossing there, nor is there any sweeping done there to aid people in crossing. The road up to Portobello-hillmarks, the principle inlet and outlet, has not any crossing, nor any sweeping to represent a crossing. I also object to the water supply. I came from Blackrock, where the Viaduct is supplied, and for a gentleman to come here and state that the water supply of Bathmains is satisfactory is a thing I cannot understand. I am very well able to judge.

4508. You know there are different opinions. Some of the witnesses, you know, are satisfied with what they have got, and some of them do not even consider it objectionable to be without water for nine hours!—Well, if they never had better water, it may to some extent explain their satisfaction with the service they have, but I consider the "hardness" alone of the Bathmains water a serious disadvantage in a direction that I do not find has been at all touched upon.

4509. I expected that Mr. Haven would have shown how great a loss was occasioned by the hardness of the water in its domestic application!—Until three weeks ago all our own laundry work was done in the house. My family is large, and my laundry is large, and we have hitherto tried to do it in Bathmains, and it proved a break down, and we have had to give it up. We expended a good deal of money on the endeavour—as much as would have paid a good water rate.

4510. I expected to have had the percentage of hardness of each water given with reference to its use for domestic purposes!—It uses much more tea to make it at a proper strength. We had, as I say, to give over

the laundry. There is another matter in which the service of this water-supplyis disadvantageously. When I purchased this house in February last, I found that something serious was wrong with the sewers, and I had an investigation made into their condition. I found the sewer laid from the house and under the house to be an excellent brick sewer, and in good order, but choked. I found on inquiry that it had frequently been choked, and I also found that the sewer of another house in the same terrace had suffered from a similar defect. Now, the sewer from the house has a very fair fall, and ought not to be choked. They are brick sewers with flat bottoms, and sewers like that won't run without having a full supply of water to keep them flushed and clean. Well, the hardness of the water is found to be such an inconvenience for toilet and other purposes, that people erect barrels and cisterns to collect the rain-water, and so keep it out of the sewers, where it is badly required, as I have said. A cistern was in connexion with the house, of about 500 cubic feet, and I had to have the sewer torn up, and a pipe constructed and the cistern removed, and my house is the third of seven that have had to have good brick sewers torn away, and pipe sewers constructed, for no reason but the want of proper flushing to keep them sweet, and that is from the desire of having soft water.

4511. Mr. CORRIGAN.—Was that brick sewer put there by the owner of the house?—Yes; by Mr. Murphy.

4512. Does the one you put in work well?—Yes; but we had to remove the cistern.

4513. You don't know if it would have worked if the cistern was left?—I did not like to trust it.

4514. Do you know what was the fall of the sewer you removed?—I believe it was half an inch in eighteen inches. That was the one I removed. Many of the houses in Bathmains were built before the cisterns were put into general use.

4515. CHAIRMAN.—Did the sewers you spoke of require the rain-water?—Yes, and I think that this may account in a great measure for the death-rate in Bathmains, which is too high for a suburb situated as Bathmains is, with every advantage. The death-rate for Blackrock township for last year was only 13 1/2, while the death-rate in Bathmains for last year was 29. I wanted to come nearer to town, but I hesitated before coming to Bathmains on account of the high death-rate. In fact, I bargained about the house on that account.

4516. Do you see any necessity for a fire brigade in Bathmains?—I do. My house is a very tall one, and I should be very sorry indeed, if a fire broke out there, having regard to the pressure and to the want of a brigade.

4517. Are you within the district where the water is shut off at night?—No; but the pressure is small, my house, as I say, is a tall one, and it is most desirable that there should be some arrangements made in the township for putting out fires promptly. I must say that many of the gentlemen who came here yesterday and the day before, describing the very excellent state of things existing in Bathmains, are owners of house property, and I say these gentlemen are not competent to give an unbiased opinion in an inquiry of this kind. They are directly interested in keeping down the rates. The tenants and occupiers, however, are interested in seeing that they are not subjected to any inconveniences and disadvantages that they would not be subjected to in any other township. Landlords are indirectly, indeed, interested in good and proper administration, because efficient administration would involve more expense and larger rates, which they would have to pay.

Mr. GEORGE WM. SHANNON, Solicitor, examined.

4518. The reason I came here is because I have heard so much and read so much from Bathmains that I thought my portion of the district ought to have some representation.

4519. CHAIRMAN.—Where do you live, Mr. Shannon. In Leeson-park—so we are just on the frontier. It is

an English mile from Bathmains. The National Institute for the Blind is on our road, and, as I say, we are on the frontier. The late Mr. Stokoe told me he considered our side the "west end" of the town, although we are at the east. He also considered that we were the most heavily taxed in the township for the area.

which we occupy. I stood in 1877 for the office of Councillor, but it is right to explain that I did so, because we thought that having regard to our taxation and position, we are not quite as well and as satisfactorily represented as we ought to be. We are a long distance from the centre of operations, and we still think that we have that grievance that we are not as fully represented on the Rathmines Board as we ought to be. Well, I am also very well acquainted with the back shans of the city, because my walks run in or through that part of the city, and I can only say that there is not to be found in Europe anything like it. I refer to the district between the Four Courts and the Registry of Deeds in Henrietta-street. You find there a mass of garbage lying for months together; the clouds are the only scavengers that we have there. I have heard witnesses give evidence as to the water and sanitary arrangements. I built my own house; it cost me about £3,500, and, therefore, was both Islington and tenement. I have lived there for eighteen years, and have been perfectly satisfied, so far as the water supply is concerned. There has been no complaint about the water. It has done me for eighteen years, and there has been no complaint about it, except during the last summer, when, for about a week, there was a deficient supply, and that was caused, I understand, from there being very great drought prevailing in the upper levels of Rathgar and Rathmines. I was of opinion, and am still, that something might be done to increase the supply at these high levels. I felt it was rather hard on them that I was able to say, 'we have plenty of water in my district, and you have not.' I thought, and think, that the Ventry might be used only as an auxiliary, for I have no idea of taking the Ventry in lieu of the Rathmines supply.

4529. *Ceteris paribus*, would you prefer the canal water to the Ventry?—Yes; I would keep it on account of its quality and quantity. So far as Leeson Park is concerned, I can speak of it favourably, in both respects, and I have an experience of it there, extending over the last eighteen years. I had a notion that the Ventry could be made auxiliary to Rathmines, on the high levels, so as to get rid of the complaints which have taken place. My bath-room is at the top of the house, and, with the exception of once in those eighteen years, there has been plenty of pressure. As to annexation, I have heard and read a good deal about it. It is a very plausible thing to have one single central body; but, from my knowledge of the inhabitants of Rathmines, I believe no practical effort can be made to induce us in Rathmines to accept the annexation with the city of Dublin in point of government. I believe, if you come to canvas the township, you will find that to be the result. We think the government of the city is not only peculiar, but we will have nothing to do with it if we can help it. That, you will find, is the fact, and that they will resist it to the last. The government in the township is good; this co-operation principle I do not agree with; I agree with Mr. Bentley as to co-operation; it does not allow the popular voice to be heard. I have often said, as to the question of the admission of the press, that the press ought to be admitted to the proceedings of the Board.

4531. Do you think the ratepayers should be admitted?—I think the press should be admitted to every public Board of the kind. I think it right to say this from my point of view.

4532. Have you ever heard any complaints about the sewers of Leeson-park?—The houses, from the

turning of Northbrook-road down to Walker's-terrace, have a fine sewer in the middle of the road. I never had to complain of the sanitary arrangements. The work is done, in fact, most satisfactorily.

4533. How often is the scavenging done—is it done every day?—No.

4534. How often—I should say about once a week.

4535. Now, take Rathmines-road as you come down to Portobello-bridge—is it right it should be only scavenged twice a week, and, until lately, that it should only be done once a week?—Well, I quite agree with the gentleman who made that statement, that from the population and the thoroughfare, it should be carefully and frequently scavenged.

4536. That gentleman said the footways are never swept, and that the part of the street where the children stand in, is not scavenged more than twice a week, and that only occasionally?—Well, I guard myself by saying that I am rarely in Rathmines, and I can only speak positively as to my own district.

4537. If you were the owner of property in Rathmines, which was otherwise built on, what would you think of an arrangement by which the water was turned off at night?—I should certainly think there would be danger in that.

4538. What do you say as to the fire brigade?—Well, we hear a good deal about it; but in my district I never knew of a fire occurring, and Rathmines is not exposed to the danger of fire in the same way as the city.

4539. May not that arise because you have not the same large paper mills living there?—For the eighteen years of which I can speak I never heard of a fire in my district.

4540. It has been stated that the Board is principally composed of house owners distinguished from occupiers?—That is so.

4541. Do you think that that is a satisfactory state of things, particularly in a township where they themselves are the persons who pay the rates for their tenants?—No; I do not.

4542. Would that not be likely to make them anxious to keep taxation as low as possible for self-interest?—I do not think it satisfactory, only to this degree, that I think the ratepayers ought to be more fairly represented on the Board.

4543. The question has been raised here, and according to Mr. Bentley's statement it would appear that twelve of the members of the Board are the largest or about the largest owners of houses in Rathmines?—Yes, so I thought.

4544. So that the twelve can of course out-vote the nine?—Yes.

4545. Mr. Bentley.—I would ask Mr. Shannon was it not stated in his address that he was an advocate for the Ventry water?—Quite so. I thought I explained that. Learning that the houses in the higher levels wasted water in the dry season, I thought it hard that whilst I had an ample supply for every requirement they should be without it. Therefore I was quite in favour of the application of the Ventry supply as auxiliary to that which already existed.

4546. Mr. Bentley.—I would ask, through the Chairman, whether Mr. Shannon has heard of cases of contagious disease occurring in Warwick-place or terrace, close to where he is?—No, I have not.

4547. Mr. Bentley.—I don't mean small-pox—I mean cases of fever?—No, I have not. I may say that my house is remarkably healthy.

MR. WILLIAM JACOB, EXAMINED.

4548. CHAIRMAN.—How long have you resided in the Rathmines district?—Twenty-five years.

4549. Do you own the house in which you live?—Yes, and I have a small property in connexion with it.

4550. What is your opinion on the question of annexation?—The reason I come here is this. I see

DUBLIN,
May 21, 1880.
Mr. George
Wm. Shannon.

Mr. William
Jacob.

DONAGH,
May 22, 1892.
Mr. William
Jacobs.

turned it off in the day time at nine o'clock, and when they were remonstrated with, it was like the case of Oliver Twist, asking for more. They extended it to ten o'clock, I think, just for an hour. Now it is not turned off till the night.

4541. Mr. Shaanen gets it quite satisfactorily—but Yes; both lives away at the other end.

4542. If they turned it off at the lower levels it would tend to help the upper ones; is there any reason for turning it off all night—I think the canal water is, as at present managed, quite suitable for Rathmines. There has been a great deal of typhoid fever, there are three or four houses out of about ten in which it occurred; in one house there were three cases within a few months; in another two, which I attribute either to the water or to the defective drainage; I can say that the drainage is not in a very satisfactory condition in our district. The drainage and sewage is conducted into the Dodder in an open sewer, and this passes through Miltown, where there are dairies. There were 368 cases of typhoid within a very short time, and when the government instituted an inquiry, 356 were traced to the water; I can't, in this case, say whether it is the sewage or the water. I don't think the sewage ought to be drained into the Dodder; besides, I must say the canal water is exposed to very great contamination.

4543. Mr. Heron—Do the Miltown cows drink the water of the Dodder—I don't know that; I understand the drainage is into the Dodder.

4544. Mr. Walker.—Are you aware that Mr. Hassard, the engineer, is going to carry out a scheme to remedy all that?

4545. CHAIRMAN.—It is said that Dublin is going to do it also; is the lighting on your road antiquated?—Well, I complained on that subject, and succeeded in getting a few loops put down. I may add as to

another point that I object to the exclusion of the press from the proceedings of the Rathmines Board. I think it is a monstrous thing that the press and ratepayers should be excluded from those proceedings. If that system was carried out throughout the country, what would be said of it?

4546. Have you got a Town Hall?—Yes; but I don't know what it is for, except, indeed, concerts, and so on; I don't know where the Commissioners meet exactly; I believe they don't meet in the Town Hall.

4547. Mr. Evans.—They meet in the Boardroom; the Town Hall is for registration purposes.

4548. CHAIRMAN.—Was it built for that purpose?—I don't know if all the Town Commissioners and Corporations and Boards of Guardians throughout the kingdom were to close their doors like a Freemason's Lodge, and forbid anyone to enter, and prevent any ratepayer having access to their proceedings, I think it would be said that such a proceeding was contrary to general common sense, and ought to be broken down. I also object to the principle of co-opting, such as is adopted—that wherever a vacancy occurs, the Commissioners fill it.

4549. That is only carrying out the law!—Where there is an election the Commissioners constitute themselves into a committee to elect whom they please.

4550. CHAIRMAN.—Is that so?—Well, practically they do; I have got different circulars from members of the committee suggesting candidates. At the last election—indeed at the two last elections—I get circulars from the Commissioners. I am speaking of what the procedure amounts to, and you will see that what I say is right, when you know that the Commissioners issue those circulars. I think they ought to leave the ratepayers to elect whom they like.

Mr. Thomas French.

MR. THOMAS FRENCH, EXAMINED.

4551. CHAIRMAN.—Where do you reside?—At 14, Upper Garville-avenue, Rathgar; I have lived for twelve years in the township.

4552. What is your opinion on the subject of annexation?—Well, I come here principally to protest against the water being shut off in Rathgar, and against the want of proper scavenging. First of all, I may say that the Lower-avenue is pretty well situated to, but the Upper is not.

4553. Are there many houses in it?—Yes; and all inhabited by respectable persons. St. Edward's terrace contains seventeen large houses, and there are at least, I should say, twenty-one houses in the avenue.

4554. And what do you say as to the scavenging?—Well, it was in such a bad state that I began to be uneasy as to my family. Some men were sent to sweep the mud on to the side of the road, and it over-flowed actually on to the very footpath on which we walk. It was left there for three weeks; and I may mention that a gentleman came to me from the county Galway, and when he saw the state of the place, he said that he never saw, even in the western part of Ireland, anything so bad.

4555. Even in Galway?—Not even in Galway. The garbage of the place was swept in, and left there untouched until it actually became green.

4556. How long ago is that?—Two years.

4557. Did you complain?—Yes, I did; I wrote to the Commissioners.

4558. And what was the result?—A set of men were sent up with brushes and spades, and they added to the bulk, by sweeping on more mud and refuse. I went down and asked to see the Commissioners, to make a formal complaint, and I was refused that privilege. I then asked to see the official who had charge of that duty, and he ultimately had it removed.

4559. Who was that?—The Inspector of roads,

4560. Maybe the Town Hall man?—This is within two years.

4561. Who was the man?—A man in uniform.

4562. But who was he?

Mr. Evans. Overseer Smith.

4563. How often is that place scavenged, as a matter of fact?—I only saw it done once this year. It is in a wretched bad state—an crossing at all, and therefore I prefer going to Rathgar to get into the tram rather than cross into Lower Garville-avenue, and I am not by any means strong.

4564. Is it on account of the want of crossings?—Yes, I never saw anything like the way the place is left.

4565. Are the roads swept?—Very seldom; only occasionally.

4566. Are the footpaths asphalted?—Well, I may mention that, at the suggestion of Brighton-road and Brighton-square people, I wrote to the Commissioners, and I received a polite note on the 7th of August last to this effect. The Secretary writes:—

"DEAR SIR.—I submitted your letter of the 20th ult. to the Board at their meeting this day, and am directed to inform you it has been referred to the Committee for consideration. Yours, &c."

In all probability the matter is now under their consideration.

4567. Is there a footway at all?—There is what they call a footway, but it is in a dreadful state, and I go great lengths away to avoid it if possible.

4568. With reference to your application to be admitted to the Board, was any explanation given for the refusal?—That it was not usual for a person like me to be received.

4569. Who gave you that answer?—was it Mr. Evans?—No, I think not, I think it was some one in the office.

4570. Within what time was it you got that answer?

—Within two years.

4571. Because Mr. Bentley read a letter, you know,

DUBLIN
May 19, 1878.
Mr. Thomas French.

on that point. He said that in 1876 he received a letter telling him that it was the rule of the Board that no deportations could be received, but that under the peculiar circumstances the Chairman would request the Board to receive that deportation. That gentleman was also informed that the usual practice was not to receive deportations. You said, yesterday Mr. Bolton, that no such rule existed.

4572. Mr. Bolton.—I said it is the rule of the Board, but that in fact we never refuse to see any—

4573. CHAIRMAN.—I certainly understood you to say last night that you were aware of your own personal knowledge there was no rule to that effect!—I said we had received deportations.

4574. What do you say then to the case of this gentleman who states that he went to make a complaint, having done so previously by letter, and asked to be permitted to have an interview with the Board and would not be allowed in?

4575. Mr. French.—And the Board was sitting at the time.

Mr. Bolton.—Well, the Board could not receive every gentleman who came there.

4576. Mr. French.—As to the water supply I come

here to protest against it. It is very uncomfortable to lie down at night with your family all round you and feel that there is no water—no protection against fire.

4577. CHAIRMAN.—What is your opinion on the subject of a fire brigade?—I think we ought to pay for the use of the fire brigades and pay for it.

4578. Do you think you ought to have the Vartry water?—Well, just in the way that Mr. Shannon said, I drink a great deal of water and I prefer the water we have to the Vartry for that purpose. I do not drink the Vartry. I do not like it. I may mention that I spoke to a Commissioner on the subject, and he said to me, "well if you get the Vartry probably it will be shut off, all over the township." I could not understand why that was, and I left it there.

4579. Who was the Commissioner?—I would rather not say.

4580. Mr. Neville.—It was stated by some one that the Vartry water was constantly turned off in Dublin. I can state positively that it is never done, except where there is a burst or some accident.

4581. CHAIRMAN.—I certainly was somewhat surprised when I heard that statement.

MR. FREDERICK BUTLER EXAMINED.

Mr. Frederick Butler.

4582. I come to represent my father, John Butler, architect, who is a large owner of property in the township.

4583. CHAIRMAN.—What is your opinion as to annexation?—I am decidedly against it.

4584. Is your father—you have both considered it?—Yes, and we are both opposed to it. We don't see what we would gain by it.

4585. Are you satisfied with the way in which the scavenging is done at present?—It is done very fairly.

4586. Did you hear the instances that have been given during this inquiry showing that it is the reverse?—Yes. I think they are exaggerations.

4587. Are you satisfied with the water supply?—Yes, except as regards pressure. In some of the higher parts there is not the full pressure that would be obtained with the Vartry.

4588. Would you be satisfied, if your father and yourself were owners of property in the district in which the water is shut off all night?—No; I would not think it right to have it shut off for the night—if that is done.

4589. But it is stated that it is shut off from nine o'clock until six in the morning in a populous district. Now, if you had property there, would you be satisfied with that?—No.

4590. You would not think it right?—No.

4591. Do you get sufficient water where you are?—Yes. I should prefer, as my own opinion, the Vartry water.

4592. Do you think it desirable for a township in which there is such a large and respectable population to be without a fire brigade?—I think it would be most desirable to have it; but I think all these matters—the fire brigade, the Vartry, and so on—are all matters that might be obtained from the Commissioners without annexation to the Corporation at all.

4593. How would it be done?—By getting the Vartry simply, by entering into a bargain with them.

4594. Were you here when Mr. French stated, with regard to his road, that the man who came to sweep it swept the mud until it overflowed on the footpath, and that it was left there?—Well, that would be doing the late snow. I know I have walked round all those roads—I knew them for a quarter of a century—and I never saw such a state of things as described.

4595. It has been said that the road leading to Portobello bridge is almost impassable!—On account of.

twice a week, and that some time ago it was only done once a week, and that even the car and cab stand was left untouched, is that right?—Not if the mud was overflowing.

4597. It is said that even that place has been left without being scavenged at all?—I don't believe it is a fact.

4598. Several witnesses told us their experience of it, as they saw it, walking along that way!—Well, it is not my experience.

4599. Is it your opinion that the scavenging is properly attended to in the locality if it is a fact, as stated by a resident on the spot, that refuse from the houses is allowed to remain sweltering there without being removed?—Well, that occurs in lanesways. There are closed up yards and lanesways where the Commissioners cannot get access to them.

4600. Is it your opinion that the Commissioners cannot prevent a nuisance in the township. Are they not the Nuisance Authority, and, as such, bound to prevent it, no matter where it occurs?—Yes; and whenever I asked them to interfere they did so very effectively.

4601. Do you know Mr. Magan?—Yes, he is a surveyor. He is a respectable man.

4602. He says there is a lanesway near his house which is perfectly disgraceful!—Well, perhaps Mr. Magan may contribute to it.

4603. Even supposing he did!—Well, if it was an open lane it is wrong, but if it is closed up by a gate which is locked it is different.

4604. So your opinion is, that where it is an open lane the Commissioners should interfere, and where it is closed up they should leave it alone?—I don't know that. I know my own father's lane are regularly scavenged.

4605. Mr. Heron.—Tell me, Mr. Butler, do you know many places where there are nuisances in private lanes and places?—There are more in private places than in public.

4606. Of what character?—Ashes and soil put out from the houses where people won't have ash pits—the refuse accumulates till it forms a nuisance. These are out of the Commissioners' control, for they are within locked up lanes.

4607. CHAIRMAN.—Are you then under the impression that a man may cause a nuisance on his own premises if it is under lock and key?—No, not exactly; but perhaps they can't go and put their heads into every lane of the kind.

4608. Surely they should employ a proper staff of men to make proper inspections and prevent such a

Dewar.
May 21, 1879.
Mr. Frederick
Hather.

thing occurring!—I know a lane and it was made an
asphalt of, and it is 100 feet long.

4630. Were the people who put the ashes there
summoned?—No, they were not.

4631. Mr. Heron.—Where was the sanitary officer?
—He was brought in, and means were taken to put
an end to it.

4631. What means?—By the landlord calling attention
to it. You could not find out who exactly was
the real delinquent in order to institute a remonstrance.

4632. How long was the lane used as you describe?
—A couple of years.

4633. And where was this?—At the back of some
of my father's houses in Leinster-square.

4634. Was it a nuisance for two years?—Yes.

4635. CHAIRMAN.—Were vegetables and refuse of
that kind lying there besides ashes?—Yes.

4636. Is your father a Commissioner?—No; he was
a Commissioner for twenty-five years.

4637. Was he one of the twelve bailiffs on the
Board?—Yes.

4638. Mr. French.—I may mention with reference
to the lane near me which was in such an objectionable
state, it has a gate on it, and the landlord refused to do
anything. I wrote to the Commissioners, and I received
the curious reply from the Secretary, saying,
that so long as the gate was there they declined to
do anything with the lane.

4639. CHAIRMAN.—Was it a nuisance?—A very great
nuisance. It is half filled with vegetable matter and
refuse. I then spoke to those who have the use of it
—five or six—and they agreed with me that it was a
nuisance that should be removed at once by paying
men to remove it. I must say I was very much surprised
at getting such an answer from the Com-
missioners.

4640. Mr. Walker.—Mr. Johnston, is there a word of
truth about the road being only scavenged twice a
week as stated here?

4641. Mr. Johnston.—It is sometimes done three
times a week—as often in fact as is necessary.
Now, as to the crossings, I heard it stated, I think,
that there was only one crossing opposite the Roman
Catholic Chapel. There are six crossings between that
and the corner of Rathgar-road. There is one
at Leinster-road, Leinster-square, the post office,
Murtagh's the butchers, and one at Flynn's, beside
the one at the chapel.

4642. Mr. Norman.—Is there any book in which
is recorded the times at which the different roads are
scavenged?—No, there is no book of that kind, the
road is well done by machinery.

4643. But you could not tell by reference to any
book when that road is scavenged?—No, there is no
record of that.

4644. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know the lane referred
to by Mr. French?—Yes, there is a door to it, and we
do not go into it.

4645. Dore not go in to remove and put down a
festering nuisance?—Well, if the inhabitants of the
township would allow us to do it, in a case like that,
we would do it.

4646. Mr. French.—I can only say that I thought
you to do it.

4647. CHAIRMAN.—Is it your opinion, and practice,
that if a man chooses to look up a roadway, and to fill
it with filth, so as to make it become a nuisance, it
should be left so—I say it is your duty to have it
removed at once. If you think there is no law for
enabling you to interfere, because there is a lock on
the gate, I can only say I deny it entirely.

4648. Mr. Heron.—Tell me, Mr. Johnston, are you
of opinion that there is no nuisance in the township?—
Very little, there is the scarpings of gardens and that.

4649. CHAIRMAN.—May I ask you do you think
refuse of cabbages, and other vegetable matter, thrown
out into lanes, is offensive, and a nuisance if allowed
to remain there?—Yes.

4650. Mr. Bentley stated that he wrote three times,
in 1878, to the Board, drawing attention to two lanes

that required the intervention of the Commissioners,
to have the nuisance abated, and he stated most positively
that they were never removed until the 3rd of May in this year, he having written again on the 3rd of May,
and being home at his own place, he says he can testify to those facts of his own knowledge.
What do you say to that?—I cannot say anything
but it.

4651. Well, Mr. Maggs has stated, with regard to a
lane in his place, that it has been in a very bad state,
as described by him, and that he remonstrated over
and over again with the Commissioners, and that
nothing was done as yet—I was not present when he
said it. I could not contradict the gentleman, but I
know that whenever there is a complaint of that kind,
men and horses are employed to clear away whatever
is complained of.

4652. But surely, Mr. Johnston, there is a letter of
the 4th of February, 1878, and others at later dates,
in addition to which he states he made several personal
remonstrances, the last on the 3rd of May, 1879,
up to which time nothing was done to remove or
abate the nuisance, that is, for over one year and
three months!—I have walked through this place and
not seen anything like what was stated.

4653. Mr. Heron.—I would again ask Mr. Johnston
is it his opinion that there is no such thing as a
nuisance in the township?

4654. CHAIRMAN.—The facts have been stated, and
if there be any mistake about them let it be pointed out.
It is surprising that if it was even believed the
nuisance had been removed, a letter to that effect
would not have been written, saying, "I am astonished
at your complaint of the 3rd, insomuch as the work
has been long since done." No such letter was written,
but the nuisance was removed on the 5th May, just
at the time we were holding this inquiry. This
shows how easily it could have been done before if
there was any wish to leave it done.

4655. Mr. Walker.—We had in a return showing
the opinion of ratepayers of Rathmines, from
which it appears that there are opposed to scavenging,
1,339; opposed to scavenging conditionally, 14; in
favour of scavenging, 152; number in favour of
scavenging conditionally, 6. There are returns marked
as "not ratepayers," "gone," and "dead," 275.

4656. Mr. Heron.—Virtually these are returns from
landlords—not ratepayers.

4657. Mr. Heron.—No, from occupiers. I have a
large number of letters from landlords all expressing
themselves opposed to scavenging.

4658. Mr. Heron.—And these returns are chiefly,
you say, from occupiers?—Yes, persons not paying
taxes, whose landlords pay the taxes, did not consider
themselves ratepayers.

4659. Mr. W. D. Andrews, Q.C., said.—It is my duty
now to open the case of the Penrhos township, and
I shall discharge that duty best by giving you, in the
first instance, the facts, before I venture to make any
observations of an argumentative character. The
Penrhos township is shown on the map before you:
and from its boundaries you will see that it comprises
a district slightly in excess of the area of Rathmines
and Rathgar. Prior to the year 1840, in which the
Municipal Corporation Act passed, it so happened that
the Penrhos township was comprised within the
limits of the city. A Commission sat continuously for
some years before 1840, and inquired into the very
question of boundaries, and the result of the labours
of that Commission was a report, and the result of
that report was, that when the Municipal Corporation
Act became law in 1840, the Penrhos township,
or what is now comprised within its limits, was
deliberately excluded from the city. It remained
within it for one purpose only, namely, voting for
members of Parliament. With that exception, since
1840, it has remained completely outside the city.
The strong and determined wish of the property
owners and ratepayers of the Penrhos township is

that it should remain outside it; and by every legitimate means in their power, both here and elsewhere, they are determined to resist and prevent annexation. Having been left alone from the year 1840 until the year 1863, they effected such improvements as they made by themselves and at the expense of individuals, and then they found themselves strong enough to go to Parliament and ask for a constitution; and Parliament having deliberately considered their application, and found that their district was such as to fit it for independent Government, passed the Act which is regarded as its charter, namely, the 16th & 17th Vict., chap. 52, local, which received the Royal assent on the 23rd of June, 1863. I don't intend to trouble you with all the details of it, for a copy of it will be laid before you, but it is right that I should in a general way give you some knowledge of its provisions. It incorporates the Town Improvement Act (Ireland) of 1854, an Act which received, as an imperial measure, all the considerations that Parliament could bestow on it, and also the general Acts which you are familiar with, and which were passed in 1847 for the purpose of facilitating the amanuiscal government of districts of the kind. The Market and Fairs Clauses Act of 1847, the Gasworks Clauses Act of 1847, the Waterworks Clauses Act of 1847, are all included in, and incorporated with it. Its constitution consists of fifteen Commissioners, an elected body; but the Earl of Pembroke, owing to the extent of his property in the township, and his agent are, and properly so, *ex officio* members of it. The qualifications for a Commissioner are residence within the township, and a £50 rating, or the beneficial ownership of rents and profits to the extent of £100 a year within the township. The voters qualification is, either to be the immediate lesser of tenants of the yearly value of £50 and upwards within the township, or a rated occupation of £10. There are ample provisions regulating the meetings of the Commissioners, the appointment of their officers, and the width of the streets. We all know the Blackrock road and the disqualification its condition has created. Any defect of repair or maintenance that may exist on that road, a considerable portion of which runs through the township, is in no way attributable to the township. It lies within the jurisdiction of other bodies, and all that the township has is the privilege of paying part of the expense. The water supply, as you have heard, is derived, by contract, from the Corporation of Dublin, who, after first taking care that Dublin shall be fully supplied, are authorised to grant, and have granted, a water supply of twenty gallons per head per day to the people of Pembroke township, from which they derive a perpetual rent of 3d. in the pound on the valuation of the township. They receive a higher sum now for an additional supply over and above the maximum given for the 3d. That is a perpetual rent. The Corporation main pipes run through the township but Dublin must be first supplied.

4640. CHAIRMAN.—Do the Town Council keep up all the mains out of the 3d.?

4641. Mr. Andrews.—Not at all. All they do is to give us the supply at certain valves from their main pipe, and we, the township, have to pay the cost of distribution—a cost which everyone familiar with the cost of waterworks knows is one of the most serious items in it. Their rating powers include a township rate of 3s. in the pound; and if the consent of two-thirds of the inhabitants be obtained at a meeting summoned by notice for that special object, it may be increased by 6d. They can levy a water rate of 1s. to meet their water requirements. Railways, canals, and works of that character, are rated at five-sixths, instead of one-fourth under the Towns Improvement Act of 1854. Their borrowing powers extend to £30,000. Their debt is considerably under that at present, and they are obliged to provide a sinking fund, in respect of which they may levy a proper sinking fund rate. These are the powers which they possess under their Act. The statistics of the township

are worth observing, because since 1863, when they obtained the status which their special Act gave them, and on the faith of which, it should not be forgotten, that the expenditure which has taken place in the township has been made—since that date, dividing the period which has elapsed into three periods of five years each, we notice that a marked improvement has taken place, in consequence, as we contend, of the admirable management which the township has been blessed with since it got its constitution. The area of the township is 1,592 acres, and that it would be most disastrous to the township to check that improvement you will see from the fact that as yet about half of it is unbuilt on. There has been a rapid increase of building improvement and expenditure, but the district is still in a transition state, and about half of it is yet unbuilt on. It is all within the Donnybrook electoral division. In 1863 its population was 13,200. I only give round numbers. The number of its houses inhabited and capable of habitation was 2,300, of which 115 were then vacant, and its valuation was £58,552. The Act having come into operation, it may be convenient to give you the statistics after the first five years. We cannot expect to find it springing into immediate prosperity, but it is very satisfactory to know that in each of the following periods of five years the improvement has increased. At the end of the first five years a marked improvement was shown, as you will recognise from these figures. Its valuation in 1868 was £65,301; its population had increased to 14,280; and its houses to 2,480, after making allowance for a number of wretched hovels which had been got rid of, and of uninhabitable buildings which had been pulled down. In 1873, at the end of the next period of five years, we notice that its progress had become much more rapid, and its improvement even still more marked. In that year its valuation had mounted to £76,575; its population had increased to 21,975, or I may almost call it 22,000, and the houses to 3,031. Every new house that had been built was a house on which there had been considerable expenditure, and which was not only well constructed but of a good class. The last period of five years that we can give details of expired in 1878, and shows a continued and marked improvement. The valuation of the township in 1878 had increased to £88,134; its population to 35,367; and the houses to 5,223, and of these there were only 70 unoccupied, while a vast number of wretched habitations had been removed. Now, I may give you an idea of how the income from rates has increased. In 1864 the 3s. rate produced £5,875 per annum. In 1873, when, by reason of the water supply and the sanitary expenses, which were not incurred in 1863 and 1864, it was laying a rate of 3s. 3d. in the pound, its income had increased to £13,710. A vast number of rates have been made and built upon, the mileage of which will be given by the witness. I believe you will find that between twenty-six and twenty-seven miles of roads are now open, the cost of which, as you can imagine, is very large indeed. The water supply has had expended on it, for distribution works, £18,000. Between £4,000 and £5,000 have been expended on asphalting and improving footways alone. 360 public lamps have been erected, as against 48 which it had in 1863. It derives its gas supply from the same source as Dublin, and it will be shown to you that the cost of lighting compares favourably with the cost in any similar district. On sewers and sanitary work it has expended already £7,260. It has an adequate sanitary staff, which includes an executive and consulting sanitary officer, two medical officers of health, and two sanitary inspectors, who are also inspectors of food. It has slaughter-houses, dairies, laundries, tramways, foundries, bottle-works, and everything that you could imagine would be required for making itself self-contained. It has adopted—and was one of the first townships to adopt—the increased powers which the Public Health Act of 1875 conferred, and was complimented in the Press for its energy and

BROOKS
May 21, 1879.
Mr. W. D.
Andrews, Q.C.

DUBLIN
May 23, 1878.
Mr. W. D.
Andrews, Q.C.

activity in so availing itself. As far as sanitary appliances go, you will find that the hospital accommodation and the means for conveying persons to hospital are adequate; and the expenditure upon its sanitary appliances and the processes of its sanitary inspection will be given to you in detail by the witness. It has meat-shops, fish-shops, and public fountains, and its financial position is most satisfactory. At present, taking into account all its debts and credits, its total liabilities do not, I believe, amount to £16,000. I think you will find that they are under that; but it will be better to give the exact details when I examine the gentleman who is most competent to give them to you. With regard to fire, the exemption from fire has been very remarkable. It has seldom had serious fire, and the loss in that respect has been incalculable. As regards the wear and tear of roads, and matters of that kind, I will take the liberty of making an observation when I come to that part of the case. The effect of annexation has been very seriously regarded, not only by the principal proprietors in the district, and those who take charge of its interests, but by other owners of property and rate-payers; and they all are firmly convinced that annexation would put a stop to the existing improvement, would materially injure the township, and place it in a condition which would be deplorable, having regard to the struggle it has made and the improvement it has achieved. Allow me for a moment to take a short view of the two sides of the question. We have Pembroke on one side, Dublin on the other. We find in Pembroke township an established government, constituted and sanctioned by Act of Parliament, tested by the periods from 1863 to 1878, and proved to be adequate to all its wants; we have good economical management; the improvement of the township marked and progressive; a vast expenditure on the faith of its existing arrangements, and a most decided objection to annexation. What have we in the body to which it is sought to annex us? It is an admission to us to be obliged to say hard things of the Corporation of the city of Dublin; but we have to deal with it energetically and unreservedly. Beyond a possibility of doubt, there is a firm conviction—and the township is not singular in this—that the management of Dublin is bad, and more than that, extravagant, and that its debt is enormous. The Corporation has nothing to offer the township. It cannot offer it drainage; the history of its own drainage is a lamentable one. After a number of abortive struggles, and a period of most culpable delay, every attempt of that kind ended in nothing; and when, after years of effort to have a main drainage scheme in which the townships could join, the townships themselves, tried out with waiting, and finding that their sanitary conditions required them to take action of themselves, came, in 1876-7, to endeavour to obtain a main drainage scheme for themselves, they were actually fiercely opposed by the Corporation. When the Corporation had no drainage to offer them they got it for themselves. They have steadily undertaken large liabilities for their scheme, which has been approved of by everyone, and, when complete, will be as good a main drainage scheme as exists anywhere. As regards markets, the Corporation have nothing to offer them. The market accommodation of Dublin is miserably bad. It has been left to a private company to inaugurate a market system, and to provide the city with respectable market accommodation. As regards scavenging, I don't care what criticism may be made on the scavenging in Rathmines, you will find that the Pembroke scavenging is good. What is the state of the scavenging of the city of Dublin? There is no use in harping on that much longer; but it has been declared by almost everybody that has any knowledge of it to be in a state simply disgraceful. As regards fire brigade appliances, have they anything to offer us? You have heard the state in which the city of Dublin fire brigade is. Some gentlemen came forward who did not take the same view that the Rath-

mines township took as regards annexation, and they spoke of the importance of having a fire brigade, and of not going to bed with an uneasy feeling that they might be burnt. But what do we know of the city of Dublin? It is a blessing that they have not more fires, because their effective officer has told us that a more responsible fire brigade is lamentably wanting in the city of Dublin. The Corporation, therefore, have nothing to offer us in this respect. But what do they offer? A little gas testing, some inspection of food, and the benefit to the inhabitants of having their clothes boiled in a digesting chamber. When we come to look at the small indemnities that are offered for annexation, I confess they seem to me rather to expose the weakness of the side that advances them. What are the plans for annexation? One very prominent argument that has been used, and will be used again, and which strikes different minds with different force, is the question of the use of the streets. It is perfectly plain that, as regards the matter of the use of the streets, there is reciprocity already. Unquestionably the township uses the Dublin streets, and unquestionably the township streets are an advantage to Dublin. There is, undoubtedly, a large quantity of traffic through the township to Dublin that is not for the benefit of the township at all. In addition to that, it is unquestionably of advantage to any city to have the greatest avenues by which it is approached maintained, as in this case they are by the townships, and at the expense of the townships. I put it no lighter than that. Suppose you were considering the expediency of levying a rate in aid, have you anything before you to show that a rate in aid ought not to be in favour of the townships? General statements on the subject might be very illusory. There is a large wear and tear of the township roads for the benefit of the city; there may be a considerable amount of wear and tear of the city roads for the benefit of the township; but still, do not the township roads benefit the city? Granted that the city benefits the township. Is there not a reciprocity, working probably a great deal better than any artificial interference would do? The case of the bridges has been put, and is a very good one to be considered. It is said—and it is a perfectly reasonable argument—that we of the Pembroke township sanctioned the principle of levying a bridge tax over a large area, and of making the distant parts of it pay for the more central parts, and why should we not, to some extent at all events, recognise the principle of applying the same rule to the approaches to the bridges themselves? I think, to a large extent, there is an answer to that. The answer has already been given, that the bridges are wholly exceptional constructions. But I may submit to you, as an argument as well, that when Parliament had that exception under consideration, and was imposing a bridge tax on the several districts, it could not have overlooked the fact that the bridges had to be approached, and yet it did not think fit to extend the Act beyond the bridges to the approaches. Thus it has been said that the artisans who crowd the city erect handsome buildings, and effect important improvements in the townships, and that therefore it is not fair that these should not be a contributor from the townships in respect of the artisans' expenditures. But has it been shown by anybody, with anything like statistical return, that these are the people who crowd the hospitals? Don't we all know that they belong to benefit societies? Don't we all know that they are making respectable wages, and that it is most difficult, when illness occurs, to get them into the hospitals; and why? Because they are in a position, to some extent at all events, to be, and have the means of being, attended at home. Am I not also entitled to invite attention to this, that if the annual rate in Dublin, the proceeds of the work they do in the townships are put into their pockets, and when they come to Dublin are spent there; and does anybody suppose that the expenditure of any class in the city is not an expenditure that keeps up no traders' shops and buildings, and thus assists

to keep the city up? Another argument which has been used is that, to a certain extent, there is a jealousy between the townships and the city, and that owing to this the one is watching the other a little more closely than persons not very fond of minute criticism wish. That had better be ended, it is said, and the admirable management of the townships had better be brought into play in the city, and members of the township board imported as new blood into the Corporation. It is not, however, proposed to reform the Dublin Corporation, so that the discussion of subjects connected with politics and religion in it shall be prohibited. They are both most important topics, and every citizen has a right to discuss them in the proper place. But Rathmines and Pembroke contend that they are not business matters, and do not come within the scope of business management. What will occur if guidance comes into the Corporation from the townships? We venture to think the result will be a fierce struggle to see who will be uppermost; and what will then happen? The side that remains uppermost will be triumphant, the others will be reduced to a minority; or else the balance will be so complete that there will be perpetual warfare. Why cannot the Dublin Corporation reform itself? Why, if they have an manageable quorum of twenty, can they not reduce it? Why should we be brought into a body which has exhibited great signs of weakness and given no security that all those elements of weakness will not continue? I think there is almost a consensus of opinion that one condition precedent to annexation should be a vast scheme of revaluation. We know perfectly well that the townships now bear far more than their proportion of any common taxation. If they are taxed for the police at the same rate as the city they bear more than their share of it. The question of revaluation must be gone into, considered, and disposed of before you can attempt, with any justice, to unite in a single area areas subject to such different taxes and valuations as these different areas are. If that be so, you ought to consider what that question of revaluation will lead to before you come to the conclusion that you should amalgamate these townships as they stand. What will it come to? Ought not some overwhelming case of public policy and necessity be made out before these townships are annexed against their will, their views and wishes set at naught, their property injured, their improvement retarded, and their taxation increased? Ought not such an overwhelming case of public necessity be one in which the townships themselves should be undivided? We venture to think it ought; and we say it is absolutely without precedent that any annexation scheme, or other scheme that the Legislature may give its sanction to, should be carried against the will of a district like this, and that it should be forced to annexation with a body against whom so much may be justly said as against the Corporation of Dublin, though, like every other body, very probably a great deal more is said against them than is just. We will endeavour to give you, these persons who can speak as to the facts, who have local knowledge and understand the wishes and feelings of the ratepayers of the township, what the condition of it is. They will be exposed to the cross-examination of my friends who are acting in the interests of the Corporation in this matter. You will have before you the facts, and we cannot but feel that when you know the facts you will come to the conclusion that the idea of constituting these townships, especially this Pembroke Township, to come in, absolutely against its will and per force, is a proposition not only novel in itself but unprecedented and unjust.

4642. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Andrews, let me ask you this. In Cork—and it will occur in other places that we will have to go to—there is a large outlying salutation district extending beyond the city proper, and full of residence. The people in some of these localities do not object to be brought in; in others they do. Take the portions that do strongly object. They admit that they use the roads of the city, and the city itself extensively; in fact as much or more than the residents of the city, as they keep horses and carriages which many of the residents don't. In a case of that kind would you say that they ought to be annexed, but that a different principle should be acted on in the case of townships established under Acts of Parliament?

Mr. Andrews.—I do; for the township here existing constitutes, and strongly oppose annexation, and say that they are in a different position from localities which have no existing constitutions, and which cannot provide themselves with the means of improvement, such as Rathmines and Pembroke possess. It is an absolutely different case where there is no existing constitution. Where a district cannot stand by itself and has not sufficient means of keeping itself in the position in which it ought to be, Parliament can step in and say "It is a public question, and there are arguments in favour of annexation." But while I do not go so far as to say that the objections of the inhabitants in a question of annexation are always supreme, I do say that you will find no instance on record in which such a township as this has been annexed against its will.

4643. CHAIRMAN.—What would the idea of the people of Pembroke township be, supposing they stood by themselves, with regard to the annexation to them of the district of Rostock? Are we to understand that they wish no annexation whatever?

Mr. Andrews.—On that point a gentleman intimate with the wishes and views of the township will speak; but as you are good enough to ask me about it I will refer you to what occurred in Rathmines. You know there were three Acts of Parliament obtained for that township, one in 1849 and two later. Whenever an adjoining district came and urged that it should be united it was found quite practicable to unite it and give it the benefits of the government that Rathmines was able to afford. There were successive additions, but there was cordial co-operation, and, in fact, the body that sought to be annexed was the body that promoted the new Bill. So that if there be a desire on the part of some outlying districts to come in and share the benefits of the Pembroke government I should be slow to say that Pembroke township would not be glad to listen to what they have to say, but certainly Pembroke township will never force them in against their will.

4644. CHAIRMAN.—But suppose they do not, must not we consider the question? The Select Committee of the House of Commons from which this Commission emanated must have naturally supposed that no persons would like to be brought into townships if their taxation was likely to be increased; and yet we have been sent to inquire into every township in Ireland, and see whether it requires to be extended. Must not we treat it, to a certain extent at all events, as the opinion of the Select Committee, that, as a rule, it is desirable that all existing townships should be extended.

Mr. Andrews.—What the Select Committee wished for was information. They abstained from giving any opinion on the point. If they had formed an opinion they would not have directed an inquiry. They wished the Commission to ascertain the views and opinions of the ratepayers.

DUBLIN,
May 28, 1873.
Mr. W. D.
Andrews, Q.C.

DUBLIN,
May 22, 1872.
John Edward
Vernon, Esq.

JOHN EDWARD VERNON, Esq., examined.

4645. Mr. Walker, q.c.—You are chairman of the Pembroke Town Commissioners?—I am.

4646. And are also, as we know, agent to Lord Pembroke?—Yes, since the year 1853.

4647. Lord Pembroke is owner of property in the city and in the township?—Yes.

4648. In each what is the amount that he owns?—In the Pembroke township he owns seven-ninths of the whole township, and in the south city he is owner of one-sixth, or very nearly one-sixth of the whole south city division. When I say owner I mean head landlord in both cases, that is to say, his property in the city is to his property in the township as six to seven. He has very nearly as large an interest in the city as in the township, but an interest in some measure of a different character. Now, prior to 1840 Pembroke township was in the city of Dublin. It was then, under a report of a Municipal Commission, thrown out of the city of Dublin for all purposes save Parliamentary voting. In the year 1841 or 1842 it was made part of the barony of Dublin in the county of Dublin.

4649. In 1853, when you became agent for Lord Pembroke, what was the condition of the Pembroke township?—Very bad indeed. It had been very much neglected, and was generally thought not capable of much improvement, for which reason it was thrown out of the city.

4650. What was the total valuation of what now constitutes the Pembroke township in 1853?—Well, I tried to obtain the valuation, but could get no valuation previous to 1848. In 1853 the valuation was £41,580.

4651. And what sum have been expended on it?—Over £40,000 has been expended on it by landlords, exclusive of the sea wall expense, which has been maintained always at the expense of Lord Pembroke.

4652. What was the cost of that?—I should originally cost over £25,000, but expenses now run very much.

4653. That is the expense of maintenance?—Yes; I have no means of knowing exactly what it cost myself, but the maintenance of it is sometimes very small, sometimes very large, depending upon the gales of wind. It was not originally well built, which makes it more expensive to keep.

4654. Owing to the outlay of the landlords have large sums been expended in buildings?—Yes—on all the new roads of the township trifling speculations have gone on.

4655. What roads have been constructed or are being constructed since you became agent in the township?—There is Burlington-road, Raglan-road, Clyde-road, Elgin-road, St. Mary's-road, Aylesbury-road, Gifford-road, and a considerable portion of Lansdowne-road, Wellington-road, Waterloo-road, Lansdowne-road, and a considerable portion of the road from the city to the Shelbourne-coal, were built on before my time. The railway station was built by me at the cost of Lord Pembroke and the railway company under a special agreement.

4656. Were these roads you have mentioned made, curbed, and paved at the landlord's expense?—Yes, and planted at the sole expense of the proprietor. No one contributed a single expense.

4657. In 1853 what was the valuation?—£58,700.

4658. What is it now?—£83,124.

4659. You tell us what has been done—making new roads and so forth in the Pembroke district. If the district had remained under the Corporation, would all this have been done?—No, certainly not. It was under my advice it was done. It was all a series of sabbage gardens flooded by the Swan stream, conveying the sewerage of the Rathmines district in the winter.

4660. What is the acreage of the Pembroke township?—1,393 acres, and 1,212 of that, I think, belongs to the Earl; 800 acres about is not built on, or thereabouts; I think the portion not built upon might be taken roughly as one-half of the township.

4661. And what would be, in your opinion, the effect of annexation as regards building?—It would be disastrous.

4662. Has Lord Pembroke ground capable of being built upon in the city?—Yes.

4663. How has it been regarded as building ground?—In about twenty-five years I have let about twelve lots.

4664. Do you know what the value of Lord Pembroke's property is?—£39,630 is the rateable value, I believe.

4665. Of course, it would be Lord Pembroke's interest to decrease the city taxation?—Yes, if it did not hit him hardly in the other.

4666. Have you property in the city?—Yes; some.

4667. Have you any in the township?—No, I am not even a voter. I reside in the city.

4668. What are the township debts?—We borrowed about £18,150, and we paid about £5,000, leaving a debt of about £13,000. There is a debt of £2,900, of which £1,200 is due to Lord Pembroke, and which bears no interest. Practically, I suppose, from £14,000 to £15,000 would cover all.

4669. The township is supplied with gas from the Alliance Gas Company?—Yes.

4670. Is it well supplied?—Well, as well as Dublin. I don't think the gas either in Dublin or in the township is very perfect.

4671. CHAIRMAN.—That £14,000 does not include the new drainage debt?—No. I thought when Mr. Walker asked the question he meant the special township debt. The new drainage debt will override the whole townships of Pembroke, Rathmines, and Rathgar. That money we are raising as we go along.

4672. Dr. Norwood.—What is your limit in the Act?—£100,000.

4673. CHAIRMAN.—How much will be on your township?—We can't tell exactly, for certain items will fall exclusively on ours—the pumping, for instance, which requires engines, and so on, and we estimate we shall be heavier rated than Rathmines, and properly so.

4674. Mr. Walker.—You are supplied in your township with Ventry water?—Yes, and were before the city. The very moment we obtained the sanction of Parliament, and with the assistance of the late Sir John Gray, we got the water before it was supplied to Dublin.

4675. Is that supply sufficient and adequate for all purposes?—Well, no; the statutable water supply of twenty gallons a day is not sufficient. Our excess water rents very nearly a third of that again. Under our agreement with the Corporation we are entitled to twenty gallons per head, and any amount over that they give us at 3*d*. per thousand gallons.

4676. Did the Corporation oppose your township bill in '63?—Yes; not on the preamble, but on the water clauses. We desired to go into the open market. Sir John Gray desired to tie us up. The result was, that the select committee before whom we were, thought it a fair question for arrangement. We arrived at a settlement under which we received our statutable supply.

4677. Will this drainage scheme be a proper and sufficient scheme?—I hope so.

4678. Will it drain every house in the township?—I think it will afford the means of drainage. When the house sewers are constructed, every portion will be thoroughly drained.

4679. Are you yourself familiar with the main drainage scheme, brought forward in 1871, by the Corporation?—Yes; I was one of the parties who opposed that bill, as far as it related to the township.

4680. Did you hear the evidence that was given in the House of Commons when the Main Drainage Act of '72 was being proved?—Yes.

4681. Did you hear the evidence given as to the state of the Liffey?—Yes.

4682. Did you hear the Lord Mayor (Alderman Bulfin it was) examined?—Yes.

4683. Do you remember the evidence he gave of the condition of Dublin, and the Liffey?—I do; I think the words he used were that “the Liffey was most intolerable, and a reproach to the Corporation of Dublin.”

4684. Did you hear Judge Barry's opinion expressed?—Yes, his evidence showed that he considered the “smell from the Liffey to be an intolerable stench.”

4685. The late Town Clerk, Mr. Heary, produced the resolution of the Grand Jury?—Yes, he produced the resolution of the Grand Jury. I don't remember the exact words, but as well as I do recollect they were, that it was “an evil of great magnitude”—that was their description. Lord Strafford also used strong expressions, and we all knew the opinion of the late Chief Justice Whistead, who urged that we should remove the Four Courts, or the Liffey, or the Corporation.

4686. CHAIRMAN.—I think he threatened to close the Courts.

4687. Mr. Walker.—Do you think that since then the evil has been diminished by the Corporation?—No; I think it has increased by every new water closet that has been added to a house.

4688. Do you remember, in connexion with the main drainage scheme of 1871, any sort of compromise with the townships being mentioned?—Yes, to this effect. We were very sceptical about it, and we succeeded in introducing a clause exempting us from taxation, until the main drainage scheme was carried out. They were likely to postpone it into the millennium, we considered.

4689. The result was that the Main Drainage Board was appointed?—Yes.

4690. You were on that Board?—Yes; they selected me to represent the township.

4691. Did you attend on that Main Drainage Board from time to time?—Yes; I attended at first, but then I gave it up.

4692. Why?—Because I thought it would come to nothing.

4693. Did you observe whether the members of the Corporation took an active part in it?—Some of them were very anxious. I think, if I remember right, a gentleman here present took a very active part in it. I think that Sir John Gray was prevented by the state of his health in '71 from acting. Dr. Norwood was chairman. We always thought there was a divided opinion in the Corporation about it, whether rightly or wrongly.

4694. Did the other members from the townships attend?—Some did very constantly. My namesake, Mr. Vernon, and Mr. Stokes invariably, I think.

4695. We know that it came to nothing?—I don't know as to that. It cost £20,000 or £30,000.

4696. But in point of benefit?—So far as I can see, it only resulted in a hole in an abutment in the new bridge, and some alterations in the Amiens bridge.

4697. Do you know what the citizens paid for that period of inaction?—Well, it was about £25,000 or £30,000; I am not quite sure; but Mr. Neville could give the figures exactly. It cost a good deal of money. It could not do otherwise.

4698. And the result was that you yourselves were obliged to go to Parliament for a measure?—Yes; we were kept in abeyance till the Act of 1871 expired, and in the interim we were exceedingly pressed by the ratepayers and the Local Government Board. An inquiry was held in the township, and a state of facts was brought before that court of inquiry which decidedly was very unfavourable to the sanitary condition of a great portion of the district. On that we decided that the very moment we were free (we were urged by the Local Government Board to do so) we should go to Parliament for an independent scheme of drainage. I think the very session (I don't think we lost a month) after the Act expired, we went in for a Bill which we are working under.

4699. Was that Bill opposed by the Corporation?—Yes.

4700. How much does the township pay towards the County-at-large charges?—In 1877 £5,300, and in 1878 £2,500. There was a considerable reduction under the Poor Law Act—in respect of lunatics, &c. In 1877 I find we paid on the valuation of £80,000 £3,378 14s 6d., and in 1878 £2,564 4s 2d., being in one case 10/- off our valuation, and in the other about 7/-d.

4701. Is the township building a new Town Hall?—They have entered into a contract for it, for £3,300. It has commenced.

4702. Is Lord Pembroke giving a free site?—Yes. He gives £8,200, or two-thirds of the contract and a free site, with a clause that if the township be annexed, the building, or rather the site, reverts to him.

4703. CHAPMAN.—When was that arrangement made with Lord Pembroke?—It is not perfected yet.

4704. The building, I think you said, has been commenced?—Well, yes. You may see the ground fencing off.

4705. I only want to see whether it has been since the report of the Select Committee of the House of Commons?—I am sorry to say we have been four or five years talking about it, and have always been afraid of the expense. We ought to have built it long ago. We sit in a most wretched place at present, as you will have an opportunity of seeing.

4706. Mr. Heron.—Where is it?—Just below the Exhibition field, at Bell's Bridge.

4707. Mr. Walker.—How many Town Commissioners are there?—Fifteen.

4708. CHAPMAN.—Will the money to be given by the ratepayers to build the Town Hall revert or be paid back under the agreement?—No, but we must pay whatever is the difference between Lord Pembroke's contribution and the cost, or they pay us £3,300, and have the building, and pay us rent for the site if they retain it.

4709. Is the rent fixed?—No.

4710. Mr. Walker.—How often do the Commissioners meet?—Once a fortnight unless specially summoned, and a committee meet on Fridays.

4711. Are the Commissioners good business men?—I think so.

4712. Is the business well attended to?—Yes.

4713. Have you any political discussions there?—Never. I think I never heard a political or religious discussion brought up since I have been Chairman—never since 1863.

4714. Are all religions represented on that board?—Fully represented, I think. I should say there are six or one and nine of the other—the six being returned by the constituency which could return the whole.

4715. In your opinion does the way the business is done contrast favourably or otherwise with the mode adopted by the Corporation?—I would very much prefer our way of doing business. We meet at eleven o'clock and go through the whole of the business of the township, and we then resolve ourselves into a sanitary board and do sanitary business. We have everything quite separate for that.

4716. Have you been Chairman since 1863?—Continually. They did me the honour to elect me every year.

4717. Are the affairs of the township well managed?—Fairly, I think.

4718. Are all the roads and sewers in good order?—I think so. I don't mean to say that they are perfect, but I would say this, they are better than the county roads on the one side, and the town roads on the other, though they are not by any means as perfect as I would wish them to be.

4719. Have you ascertained the feelings of the ratepayers on the question of sanitation?—I think I know the feeling of most of the ratepayers, and I don't think I ever heard one of our members or ratepayers say he would like us to be annexed to the Corporation. I think a good many would like to find fault with us, and quite properly, but they would rather bear with

BERLIN,
May 23, 1878.
John Edward
Vernon, Esq.

DUBLIN
Aug 22, 1878

John Edward
Vernon, Esq.

the evils they know, than the evils they don't know. I believe, indeed, that the township is almost unanimous on the subject. If you exclude those gentlemen who are members of the Corporation, and who hold property in the township, you will find that to be the case.

4730. You have two hospitals in the township!—Yes; the Insurable Hospital on one side, and the City of Dublin Hospital on the other.

4731. Are the sanitary arrangements in your township good!—They are fair; I don't think they are perfect.

4732. What staff have you!—Dr. Murdock and Dr. Chapman, our medical officer and consulting medical officer, an executive sanitary officer, two sub-sanitary officers, and a disinfector. Mr. Robinson is our secretary, and Mr. Phelan is our sub-sanitary officer. Mr. Madden is also a sub-sanitary officer, and then there is Donovan, who undertakes the agreeable task of disinfecting.

4733. Have you always endeavoured to attend to my complaints on the question of sanitation!—I have certainly always tried to do so. In some cases we have been utterly unable to meet the complaints, for the simple reason that we had not sufficient funds, and without our system of main drainage we could not do what we would wish.

4734. And until that is completed there may be cases of that kind arising!—Undoubtedly. Yes; persons have complained, and I think very rightly—we had only a fall of about eighteen inches from Sandymount to Blackrock to survey the sewerage.

4735. Are there slaughter-houses in your township?—Yes, there are six, I think.

4736. Are there by-laws in force in your township for their management!—Yes; not only by-laws for them, but a whole system of by-laws—which has not been finally approved of—under the Sanitary Acts.

4737. Since the Act of 1878 came into force have you proceeded to carry out that measure!—Yes, the very instant it came into operation we proceeded within a few weeks to issue the full notice to our ratepayers. The by-laws were framed as carefully as possible, and they required a good deal of consideration. They have to be approved of by the Local Government Board.

4738. Have there been many fires in the township!—Very few. Most of the houses are insured under a clause in the lease. I never had to call on any one to rebuild in twenty-five years, so that there could not have been much damage caused.

4739. Now, you know yourself intimately the state of the city, and, from your management of the Pembroke property, can you say whether the state of the lanes and roads in your township contrasts favourably with the city!—I do; I think the lanes in the city are very badly kept.

4740. From your own knowledge of the property can you give any instance of that!—I can fairly and truly say that part of the lane going down to my own house is as bad as it can well be. The other day part of a holding fell out of lease, on which about forty houses are. The lease falls out in March, and there was then a heap of filth in the centre of these houses. It was left there ever since, but it has been nearly carried away by the action of the weather.

4741. We heard a good deal as to kerbing—can you say that your township contrasts well with the city in that respect!—All our footpaths are kerbed where there are buildings, and Lord Pembroke never made a road that has not been handed over to the township fully kerbed. Some of the rural roads with fields on both sides are not kerbed, nor do they require it till houses are built on it.

4742. Mr. Moore, q.c.—You know, Mr. Vernon, that Pembroke is part of the ancient city of Dublin!—I do; at least I am not quite certain of what that word means; but it was included within the city boundary.

4743. And that it went as far as Blackrock!—Yes.

4744. Do you think it of advantage that the whole

of the city of Dublin should be under a divided management!—The whole of the city!

4745. The whole of the city!—Yes. I follow you. I think it very desirable that the city, having thrown off its weak and poor neighbour, should not try to take him back when he is worth something.

4746. Do you think it of advantage that after defining the city of Dublin it should be under divided management!—I think it very desirable that the part now known as the Pembroke township should not go into the city.

4747. You have the advantage of parliamentary representation!—Well, yes.

4748. How many electors are there—how many voters for the city!—I have not a notion; I have not taken the slightest part in politics in the city.

4749. You know the number of ratepayers!—3,500, I think.

4750. Well, one-half of these would not, I suppose, be voters; suppose, then, we had 1,500 electors!—I should not say so, but I really don't know.

4751. You think it fair that the residents in Pembroke should have the franchise and should not contribute to the city taxes!—I give no opinion as to the franchise.

4752. You, but do you think it fair!—That is a political matter I never considered.

4753. Do you think that taxation and representation ought to be generally co-existent!—No doubt the principle is true, but I do not think it comes in there.

4754. That it does not apply to Pembroke!—Not the parliamentary representation; but I do in the sense of being represented in this room.

4755. As to the boundaries—now, do you think the parliamentary and municipal boundaries ought to be the same!—I think so, if the town desire to restrict the franchise, and they did not think so when they turned us out—they were satisfied to get rid of us then.

4756. Do you think, as a rule, that parliamentary and municipal boundaries ought to be the same!—Yes; I think it would be a proper thing—that is, if I were starting to form a municipality and parliamentary representation, I should make them identical.

4757. What will your rate be next year!—Our rate for last year, I may say, amounted to 2s. 10d., exclusive of our drainage.

4758. I thought you said it was 3s. 3d.—some one said it was 3s. 3d. 4d.—Well, the figures would be 2s. 10d.; speaking from memory we have 2s improvement rate; water rate 7d.; land to make good the money borrowed on the water rate—I forget what it is—3d., and then we have 3d. to meet the main drainage.

4759. That is 3s. 3d. 4d.—Yes; 2s. 10d. is our township tax, and 8d. comes in under the precept for main drainage which we are obliged to pay.

4760. Now, you used very strong language about the proposed annexation being absolute ruin to the township!—Certainly, to the suburb-on part of it. You would increase the taxation, and you would give us a representative body in which we have no confidence, in the city of Dublin.

4761. As to the suburb-on portions, is it not a fact that Lord Pembroke makes roads and sewers and plants trees!—Yes.

4762. Without getting any of that expenditure from the Commissioners!—Not a shilling.

4763. What is to prevent his going on on that system still!—There is no use fishing in a place if there is no fish. There is no use my having roads, if builders cease and say, "we won't build under the Corporation." It may be a non-apprehension of theirs, but they do it.

4764. Is it a prejudice or what!—They won't build within the precincts of the Corporation unless it is a charitable institution, or public building, which under special acts will be exempt from taxation.

4765. Is that owing to the valuation!—I can't say.

4766. Well, I ask your opinion!—Then I should say, first, it is owing to increased taxation, which

they apprehend; and secondly, they have not any confidence in the Corporation.

4756. Are you of opinion, as some intelligent gentlemen are, that the Corporation of Dublin is insolvent?—Well, looking at the parliamentary returns, we find that they spent £30,000 more than their income from 1875 to 1878, and I know what effect that would have upon a private individual—he would get no credit.

4757. Are you of opinion it is insolvent?—The test is the rate at which money can be borrowed, and if you take the credit of the Corporation into the money market, you will find a great many men will shake their heads, very wisely, but they won't lend the money.

4758. Have you investigated the financial position of the Corporation, and considered the value of the city estate?—No. Except the returns.

4759. Do you look upon the figures that have been given as illusory?—I assume the parliamentary returns give them correctly. I quite assume that to be the case.

4760. And do you imagine they could not get any money under seven or eight per cent?—Oh no; but we borrow our money at four, and I don't think they can do so, so far as I know the money market.

4761. Who were the promoters of the original Penrose township bill?—Well, there were a variety of people. I was one of the parties. It was originally taken up by a professional gentleman, I think, and he came to me on the matter, and I supported him.

4762. Was the Penrose township not peculiarly situated, in one great proprietor having as proprietors an interest?—The proprietor, practically, had nothing to say to the original movement. There were several meetings of the ratepayers on the subject, and they objected to it (that was before my time). After that, the ratepayers appeared to have changed their minds and to think they ought to have some form of Government. The formation of township areas in this way, discontent existed about lighting, portion of the township was lighted by subscription; a good many people put down their names and omitted to pay their subscriptions, and there was no means of compelling them. The ratepayers then met, and thought they would suggest some form of Government.

4763. Do you know how it was managed that you retained the city franchises, while you escaped the city rates?—I don't know. That would be as far back as 1860. I was not a resident in Dublin then.

4764. What return do you say, or can you refer me to, by which it appears that the Corporation of Dublin are spending or have spent, £30,000 a year more than their income?—The parliamentary return 435 of 1875. On the 1st of June '75, the city debt was £781,931, secured partly on the city estate, while at the end of the financial year, the local taxation return gives the amount secured on the rates £631,506, and secured on the city estate, £1,95,746. Well, then again, at the end of the next financial year, 1878, I find secured on the city rates £663,000, and on the city estate £184,804, or in other words, you find the total amount of the debt in 1875 £781,977, and in 1878 £866,854. If you deduct one from the other it would appear to me to leave £84,877, and dividing £84,877 into three, it would leave very nearly £30,000; the figures are taken from public documents.

4765. Does your Board meet in public?—No.

4766. Do you receive deputations?—Yes. I don't think we ever refused to receive any ratepayers.

4767. Would you approve of the rule of the Roads and Bridges Board to refuse to receive deputations?—No; I should disapprove of any such arrangement.

4768. Why do you exclude the Press?—Because we like business, and don't care about ostentation.

4769. Do you think the Press ought to be excluded?—The last worked Boards are those where the Press is excluded. I am glad to say the Select Committee has taken the same view with reference to one of the most important Boards in Dublin—the Port and Docks

Board. I would extend that to all meetings where business is to be carried on.

4770. How long does the Board meet?—We meet at eleven, and sometimes sit until three. We sit as long as business is to be done.

4771. Do you think one hour each Board day would not do?—We could not do our business in an hour.

4772. As to the main drainage scheme of 1871, are you aware that there was a great rise in prices after 1871?—I am.

4773. Was not that one of the main causes of the stoppage of that scheme?—Yes; I believe the contractors paid us were at an extravagant figure.

4774. Was there not a great change in the price of iron and other materials?—Yes.

4775. Did the members of that Board appear to you hankily to do their best to carry out the purpose for which they were elected?—I think so, as a body.

4776. Did you ever hear any question of politics referred to there?—No; but we had no Press present, if I remember right.

4777. Do you really imagine that if the Press were present politics would have been introduced?—I do not imagine it; I am sure of it.

4778. As to the Penrose property in the South City District, when did you last lay out any roads in it?—I never laid out any.

4779. Have you brought any of that into the market for building?—Oh, whatever there is of it was laid before my time.

4780. You, of course, act in the best interest of the East of Penrose, and you have not laid out, planted, or sown it?—No, because my predecessor did it. He made Wilson-square, and left the whole side there pining for a builder, and how long more it will remain so, indeed I don't know.

4781. Are the works of your main drainage being carried on as rapidly as possible between Ball's-bridge and London-bridge?—Between Elgin-street and the Pigeon-house, between Ball's-bridge and London-bridge. The greater part of the low level sewer is carried in as far as London-bridge.

4782. Have you met any obstacles there as to owners of land?—Well, yes; but not very much—nothing that will cost as more than £400.

4783. No real obstruction?—No; I am informed so by the professional gentleman managing it.

4784. Are some gentlemen asking more than you think reasonable?—Yes.

4785. You did not commence the sea-going works yet?—Yes, outside the Pigeon-house; and I may mention that we varied the course of it somewhat, so that we shall have less cut-and-work. It is going on now.

4786. You limit the district at which you will discharge the sewer?—No; there is no necessity for that.

4787. Mr. Corrigan.—You are not altering the outfall?—No; we are merely keeping a little inside instead of outside the Pigeon-houses to facilitate the work.

4788. Mr. Heron.—Within what time will the contract be completed?—They will be finished, I expect, next year. I believe the contractor has expressed himself sanguine of being able to complete them next year.

4789. But after that the old ones will have to be continued?—The low level sewer will at once discharge all the sewerage, and the houses must be connected with the sewer. We shall have to make some subsidiary sewers.

4790. When will the low level ones be discharged when the high level sewer is complete?

4791. And when is the outfall to be completed?—At the end of next year.

4792. Will it be within the contract time any way?—That is the avowal of our engineer.

4793. Will that sewer be running in two years?—

DEBATE.
MAY 27, 1878.

John Edward
Trotter, Esq.

DUBLIN,
May 23, 1881.
John Edward
Vernon, Esq.

No doubt, and would be running sooner only for the delay incident to leaving the sewer available for the south side of Dublin.

4794. You said that Lord Pembroke's interest in the city and the township was six to seven?—Yes, roughly.

4795. In the city is it mainly derived from head rents?—Yes, and so it is in the township.

4796. But have you not in the township valuable landed property unlet?—Yes, but it is only valuable when let. It is agricultural land at present.

4797. Ten years ago was the city property more valuable than the township property?—No, oh no, you could go back perhaps to the time that it was, but I don't know when it was.

4798. Are you at this moment laying out new roads in the township?—I have not begun them, but there are two in prospect. We are waiting to see what Mr. Exton says on the question before him.

4799. Will you continue making roads?—If builders will tell me they will build I will lay out the roads, but not till then.

4800. You are satisfied with the lighting of the township?—It is about as good as the Dublin lighting, and I don't call that good. On the contrary, I think Dublin is a badly lighted city.

4801. Did you hear Mr. Hassard's evidence as to the heavy rate of taxation for water?—Yes.

4802. And do you concur in that?—It is scientific, and I don't know what to say to it.

4803. How many men have you engaged attending to the roads?—I could not exactly tell you. I could tell the expenditure for the year. I think it is £3,000 on our roads, including kerbing, crossings, and scavenging.

4804. How long have you been under public audit?—We are not under it except for main drainage and sanitary work.

4805. How are your accounts audited?—By auditors chosen by the ratepayers at the annual meeting.

4806. That is at the time the Council is elected?—Yes.

4807. Who are the present auditors?—Well, I could not tell you; the secretary will be able to tell you. I never attend the annual meeting. I have not attended, as I never vote in the matter. I leave it to the ratepayers to elect whom they like; it is their business.

4808. CHAIRMAN.—Do you agree in the principle that no new township should be allowed to be erected within two miles of another?—No; I don't.

4809. The Select Committee reported that a new township should not be created within two miles of another?—Well, that is a question I never considered.

4810. Now, as to the debt of the Corporation, did you see the return compiled and given us by Mr. Pim, of the debts of the Corporation, as compared with other places?—Yes; I heard it, but I can't see how you can compare Dublin with Leeds or Manchester—you might as well compare it with London at once.

4811. But suppose Dublin really owes £230,000, On revaluation the gross valuation would be at least £800,000; do you think one year's income would be an excessive debt for it to owe?—No; not for the Corporation to pay, but it is a different thing for the Corporation to ask a neighbour to pay it for them.

4812. The city estate was stated to be worth, at this moment, £500,000, if sold in the market, and that in 1880 or 1881 it will produce £27,000 a year; and, further, that it never was more than £100 in arrear, arising from weekly rents at Baldeyle. If these figures are true, would you still be prepared to say that Dublin is overburdened with debt?—If that state of facts was true, I would say the Corporation was a most benevolent and tender-hearted spider in asking others to come into its parlour.

4813. We have the accounts passed by the Government auditor, showing that the present city estate, along with the rents at Baldeyle, produces, in round numbers, close on £10,000 a year!—As a ratepayer of the city, I am glad to hear it.

4814. Accounts produced also show that by the falling in of leases, which are named, it will be increased to nearly £27,000 by 1881!—Well, if that be so, why do they want us, we are satisfied to remain where we are.

4815. It will be increased by £7,000 a year in 1881, and within twenty years, taking every life that is in the lesser than outstanding to live to the age of seventy-five years, it will then increase by £16,000 a year more!—Then, in the name of goodness, what do they want with us? Can't they let us alone, and we will rejoice in their prosperity?

4816. Surely there cannot be any doubt about it. They give the names of the houses in the leases, and of this I am certain—that Mr. Finley has charged them with the receipt of about £19,000 a year city estate, and they have had to discharge themselves from it!—Then why, again, I say, Mr. Chairman, why do they want us?

4817. One gentleman said if the city were annexed to Rathmines it would beggar them.

4818. Mr. Bolton.—I said it was a case of beggar-my-neighbour.

4819. Mr. Vernon.—If their circumstances are so great and flourishing, why do they want us?

4820. Mr. Heron.—What is it that you don't believe in this statement as to the city estate?—Oh, I am quite sure that whatever they have they spend.

4821. Dr. Forrest.—The total area on the city for thirty years and upwards, was only about one-half per cent.

4822. CHAIRMAN.—The year's rent which they are charged with by Mr. Finley in having received, is £17,297 9s. 5d., and the arrear brought forward adds it altogether £26,330 9s. 1d. They received out of that £19,903, leaving the arrear something the same as before!—Then why want £10,000 a year from Rathmines, and why want us?

4823. They say they want it at present, and that it will be for your benefit in the future?—Yes, there is the fly and spider again. They want money to carry out their works, and we don't want to give them money, if we can help it.

4824. You meet twice every month?—Yes; the Board meet twice every month.

4825. Do you find that for the management of your township it takes you two or three hours to transact your business?—Yes; sometimes a couple of hours, and sometimes a great deal more.

4826. We have also to consider not only the question of annexation to Dublin, but of the townships to one another—would you be inclined, as far as your township is concerned, to be amalgamated with Rathmines?—No, because Rathmines is very well able to take care of itself. I am for Home Rule. I don't want to annex or be annexed.

4827. Have you the undivided services of your surveyor?—Yes.

4828. What salary do you pay him?—£250 a year.

4829. Do you think that it is desirable to have the undivided services of the surveyor of a township?—Yes, and I think there ought to be work enough for him to do.

4830. How many miles of roads have you?—Twenty-six and a half miles, including lanes and minor roads. Our surveyor has, of course, had less to do for so much, so many of the roads being maintained by the proprietor.

4831. Notwithstanding all these roads being maintained, and so well done, by Lord Pembroke, do you think it right to have the undivided services of the surveyor?—I think so; I think he ought to be on the road every day.

4832. The number of houses in Pembroke is 3,227, and about the same number in Rathmines. Your auxiliary staff consists of a consulting sanitary officer, an executive, and two sub-sanitary officers; do you find that that staff is proper and necessary to work your township?—Yes, but I am bound to say that

our township requires more sanitary attention than Rathmines, we have greater difficulties to contend with, which I think will be all done away with, or dealt with when we get the artificial outfit we are seeking.

4833. From your knowledge of the working of the township would it be possible to attend to it properly or satisfactorily with a Board meeting one day in the month?—No; twice a month would be better; meeting only once a month has this objection—that complaints, if made, are not answered at once. Complaints ought to be answered at once, or as soon as possible.

4834. What do you say to the rule of a Board to meet once a month at 9 o'clock, and not to take up any new business after 10 o'clock?—It would be quite possible if the work was done by Committees. In some of the larger institutions the work is done by Committees.

4835. Mr. Forrester.—I would ask your leave, Mr. Chairman, to say that what I stated was no new business was taken up without proper notice; we do all we can in an hour, and if special business is given notice of, we dispose of it.

4836. CHAIRMAN.—I have the evidence before me given by a gentleman who described himself as having been CHAIRMAN for a number of years, he told the Committee of the House of Commons that no new business was ever taken up after 10 o'clock, so that every gentleman might safely leave the Board at 10 o'clock, for he knew with certainty that no new business would be taken up, and that, therefore, he might safely go away.

4837. Mr. Cotton.—Was it ever discussed—the property of taking in Roebuck to Pembroke?—Some people about SIRROD'S-court were in favour of it, if the people were unanimous, but they were found not unanimous, and they would be bad members if they were brought in without their wish.

4838. CHAIRMAN.—I understand you to say you always received any delegation of the ratepayers?—Yes; I think we should be very unfit to be Commissioners if we did not.

4839. What do you say to a Board where the usual rule was not to receive a delegation?—Well, I can't well give an opinion; I certainly would not be in favour of it. I think it is the proper thing to listen to complaints, even if you cannot redress them.

4840. Are you satisfied with the supply of water from the Varty?—Perfectly.

4841. As a chairman of township Commissioners, is it, in your opinion, proper that any portion of an inhabited district, particularly one largely built upon, should have the water shut off for nine hours every night?—It is tempting on the ground of economy; we tried it but we came to the conclusion that we had no right to do it.

4842. Did you give it up?—Yes; but our position differs very much from others; we rely very much upon high pressure as a means of extinguishing fires, so that if the water was shut off at night and a fire occurred, it would be fatal to us.

4843. But in Rathmines or rather in Rathgar, they say they have not high pressure, and if so, must it not be doubly fatal?—They might have other means.

4844. They certainly have a fire engine?—We rely more on the hydrants.

4845. Have you a staff to look after them?—No; except our own men.

4846. Does your surveyor, as part of his general duty, look after that?—It is his duty to see that the hydrants are in order.

4847. Ready at a moment's notice?—Yes; ready to apply the pressure which we ought to have, but which I believe we do not always have.

4848. Mr. Heron.—Are those the hydrants that water the streets?—Yes; they do it with a hose attached.

4849. CHAIRMAN.—You said, just now, the pressure

you "ought to have"?—Yes; the pressure is not as high as it ought to be, I do not know the reason why, because the level that supplies us ought to give a very high pressure.

4850. As far as you know do the Commissioners largely own property in the township?—Some of them do, a good many of them have large sums of money laid out in house property.

4851. But the large majority?—I should say a majority of them are owners, but that rests with the electors.

4852. When an election takes place with your body, do the board send out circulars suggesting the names of candidates?—Never; I never heard of such a document emanating from the Commissioners, suggesting the name of a member, I never saw such a document. I, myself, never attended an election, or expressed an opinion concerning one. I believe it is a matter that should be done absolutely by the ratepayers.

4853. Now, look at the portion marked yellow on the map—do you see the portion north of Milltown, should that not be annexed to the township?—Well, the town of Milltown ought to be, perhaps, but the rest is all occupied by villa.

4854. Do not the people in the villa drive through the city and through your township?—Yes; but there is a reciprocity in that regard—men bringing in stones and so on—it is a mere debtor and creditor account.

4855. Take the case now of a man living say close to Booterstown, at the furthest point of your township, does he not get all the benefit of your roads driving over them himself and his family?—Yes, but you must stop somewhere. You can't prevent his driving in.

4856. Should he not pay something for it?—No, you might go over the whole of Ireland that way.

4857. Do you think that, by rate in aid or otherwise, Penrith should pay something towards Dublin?—No. The greatest hardship was putting the bridges on the metropolitan boundary. We have four or five bridges in our small boundary, and if they went down I don't believe they would be rebuilt by the Corporation of Dublin.

4858. Mr. Heron.—Do you approve of co-opting?—No, I do not; in a township administering public funds I should prefer open election, in the same way I would have the board-room open to the public, and not to the press.

4859. CHAIRMAN.—Now we will suppose that the Dublin Corporation improved and agreed not to discuss politics?—I could not fancy it—it would be the mildest. When the Dublin Corporation shun politics and religion, I will then consider annexation. They are a first-class political organisation, but equally they are a very bad local administration. I think myself the things are inconsistent.

4860. Their proposal was to reduce the number by fifteen, and give it to the township—Well, however you do it, this room will be about the hottest in Ireland. Our interests are dissimilar, our politics are dissimilar, and we will fight it out till we find out who is the strongest, and in this country the strongest will give the weakest very little fair play.

4861. Mr. Forrester.—I was not here when Mr. Bendley made the statement about circulars. I have been led to suppose you were informed the board of Rathmines sent out circulars expressing a wish for the election of certain gentlemen named. Now, our board never interfered with any election. The retiring candidate sent out circulars of their own act, telling when the election is to be, and seeking re-election; but there is no board's order for issuing them. At the last time five were going out and one died, and the five took the liberty of adding the name of a gentleman who had been an opponent of theirs, but no action was taken by the board whatsoever. It is only fair that I should put you right.

DUBLIN,
May 21, 1872.
John Edward
Vassan, Esq.

BRENTON,
May 12, 1878.
Mr. A. H. ROBINSON.

Mr. A. H. ROBINSON, examined.

4862. Mr. *Andrews*.—You are secretary to the Pembroke township?—I am, since 1870.

4863. You have been acquainted with the township from an earlier date?—From 1863.

4864. As we know the governing body consists of fifteen members, including an ex-officio chairman, of whom one-third retire annually?—Quite so.

4865. Your board, as we have heard, meets fortnightly?—It does.

4866. You have a works committee and a finance committee once a week?—We have.

4867. I suppose no cheques can be drawn unless the accounts have passed that committee?—They must be passed at the finance board.

4868. The township contains 1,592 acres?—Yes, and over half of that is you unbuilt upon.

4869. Is the entire township within the Dennybrook Electoral Division?—Yes.

4870. Your population in 1863 was 15,900 in round numbers?—Yes.

4871. How many houses were there in the township?—About 3,200, of which 115 were vacant.

4872. And your then valuation?—£58,752.

4873. How were you off for roads then?—It was, at that time, like most other rural districts; the roads were in a very poor condition. They were not sewer'd; there were no street crossings; and there were only about forty-eight public lamps.

4874. How were these supported?—By voluntary contributions.

4875. Were your roads watered at all?—No.

4876. What sort was your water supply?—It was very inadequate; a portion of the district received its supply from the canal; the Sandymount district was supplied by imported barrels of water.

4877. What class of houses were then in the township?—The class of houses?

4878. Mr. *Heron*.—Mr. Robinson can only know that from history.

4879. *Westoe*.—I am speaking from my own knowledge of the district. I knew it prior to my becoming secretary.

4880. Mr. *Andrews*.—Give me a classification of the houses?—Over one-fourth of the houses consisted of wretched habitations ranging in valuation from 30s. to 40s.

4881. As regards the drainage, you had a huge open drain at that time?—A large open drain traversed a considerable portion of the township, from Shelbourne-road to the Dodder.

4882. Was there any sanitary supervision at all?—None.

4883. Were there a number of tenement houses without any proper supervision?—The tenement houses had little or no sanitary accommodation, and those which had were so dilapidated as to be quite a nuisance.

4884. In 1868 what was your valuation?—The valuation in 1868 had increased from £58,752 to £55,331, being an improvement of £4,569.

4885. And your population?—It had increased from 15,900 to about 14,800 persons.

4886. The occupied houses were how many?—They had increased from 2,200 to 3,430.

4887. Passing over another five years, what was your valuation in 1873?—It had risen to £75,575; and the population to 21,974.

4888. And the number of inhabited houses?—To 3,031.

4889. What was the valuation of the township in 1873?—It had risen to £86,124; the population had increased to 23,847, being an improvement of seventy-seven per cent. since 1863.

4890. What was the number of houses?—They had increased from 2,200 in 1863 to 3,225, being an increase of 1,025, equivalent to 47½ per cent.

4891. How many were unoccupied?—The unoccupied houses were only 10, as against 115 in 1863.

4892. Give me the income from rates in 1864?—The

income from rates in 1864 was £3,875. In January of this year it was £13,710, being an increase, during the fifteen years, of £7,835, equivalent to 133½ per cent.

4893. Mr. *Vernon* has told us that a vast number of roads have been constructed since 1863?—A vast number of roads have been constructed by the Earl of Pembroke and his successors since 1863. The Clydes-road, Elgin road, Northumberland-road, Aylesbury-road, Griffield-road, St. Mary's road, Simonscourt-road, Bushfield-terrace, Carlisle-avenue, Carlisle-terrace, part of Shelbourne-road, a considerable portion of Marshampton-road, and Lansdowne-road, have all been built since 1863.

4894. I need scarcely ask if the expenditure upon them must not have been very great indeed. We have already got the extent of the roads?—About 29½ miles.

4895. With respect to your water-supply, you have paid for the distribution of it yourselves?—Quite so. The Commissioners have spent £16,000 on distribution works.

4896. How many miles of mains were laid by yourselves?—Over twenty-two miles.

4897. We know, from Mr. *Vernon*, the arrangement with the Corporation respecting the water-supply, so that I will not go over it again. How much have you spent on asphalting the footways?—18,400 square yards of superior asphalt have been laid at a cost of £4,610.

4898. Have you numerous street crossings?—Yes, on every road.

4899. What number of public lamps have you now?—At present there are 360. There were only forty-eight at the start.

4900. What have you spent on sewer and sanitary works?—About £1,760. That does not include anything for main drainage?—No.

4901. You became the Urban Sanitary Authority in 1874?—Yes.

4902. And when the Act of 1878 was passed you principally availed yourselves of it?—Quite so.

4903. I would like to have your sanitary staff, although I believe they have been given already?—We have an executive sanitary officer, a consulting sanitary officer, two medical officers of health, two sub-sanitary officers, a disinfector, and a scavenging staff.

4904. The sub-sanitary officers inspect food as well?—Yes; they are food inspectors also. It is part of their duty to take samples of food.

4905. How many slaughter-houses have you?—Six registered slaughter-houses in the district.

4906. In addition, you have dairies, laundries, bakers, and so forth—I need not go over them!—We have.

4907. We are aware, from what has already been proved, of the position in which you stand respecting main drainage, and that it is progressing?—Quite so.

4908. CHAIRMAN.—Have you the Lodging-house Act in force?—We have no public lodging-houses in the district at all.

4909. Mr. *Andrews*.—Give me your expenditure during the years 1877 and 1878 on sanitary works.

4910. DR. *Herwood*.—I wish to know over what period the expenditure on sewer and sanitary works of £1,760 extends; is that since the commencement?—Since the commencement. Until quite recently it was not in the power of the Commissioners to do much in the way of sanitary improvement. They were always looking forward to the contemplated main drainage works.

4911. Mr. *Andrews*.—That does not include the sewers constructed and paid for by Lord Pembroke?—Not at all.

4912. Nor your main drainage expenditure?—No.

4913. In 1877 alone, what did you expend on sanitary works?—£1,400.

4914. In 1877?—In 1877.

4915. And in 1878?—£1,000.

4916. How many house inspections had you last year?—There were 11,440 house inspections in the year.

4917. How many notices for the abatement of nuisances were served last year?—1,000.

4918. How many back-yards were cleaned?—1,600.

4919. How many privies and cesspools were cleaned and repaired?—3,010. There were forty-six new ones erected.

4920. How many rooms were lime-washed?—3,000.

4921. How many were disinfected?—150.

4922. CHAIRMAN.—Did you do all this under the provisions of the Public Health Act of 1875 and 1881?—This is a return for the year 1878; our operations were under the Acts of 1875 and 1878.

4923. Of 1878?—Yes; of last year.

4924. That only came into operation at the end of the year?—In August, 1878. We had powers under the Act of 1874 before that. The Act of 1878 only gave us increased powers.

4925. I am calling attention to it because it appears that return that a large amount of sanitary supervision took place in your township, and I was told that in Bathurst they had no power of doing the same things until after the passing of the Act of 1882.

WILSON.—We have been working actively since the Act of 1874.

4926. Mr. ANDREWS.—Will you give me the number of yards of sewers constructed in the past year?—Nine hundred and thirty-three yards, of which 603 are built, and the remainder are pipes. These were private sewers also, but these are public ones.

4927. How many public fountains are there in the township?—Thirty-three, which are open to everyone.

4928. Are the slaughter-houses properly looked after by the sanitary inspector?—They are constantly looked after.

4929. CHAIRMAN.—Have you bye-laws for them?—Yes; since 1866. They were prepared under the Act of 1866, and not under our special Act.

4930. Mr. ANDREWS.—Give me the per centage of dilapidated and ruinous buildings that have been removed?—I should say about seventy per cent.

4931. That is in the whole period?—Yes.

4932. Have you, since the last Public Health Act, submitted by-law for the approval of the Local Government Board?—We have; they are now under the consideration of the Local Government Board.

4933. We know what your borrowing powers are under the Act of 1863. What is your debt at present?—The amount of the statutable loan at the present time is £13,157, and on foot of current liabilities there is £3,458—making a total of £16,615. Of the loan, £6,700 is for water, £3,103 for asphalt, and £1,550 for sewers.

4934. Now, as regards fires, I believe Captain Ingram enumerated the eight fires you have had?—I think Captain Ingram, in his evidence, went back a period of thirteen years, to 1863. That was some years prior to the introduction of the Valley water into the Pembroke township, we could not do much then towards extinguishing fires, we had no water.

4935. However, the eight fires which he enumerated occurred during the period from 1865 to 1878?—They did.

4936. What was the worst fire?—I think it was in a stable at the rear of Elgin-road. It was said to be malicious, and the damage was sought to be recovered off the county.

4937. You have numerous fire hydrants on every road?—We have, and all the fittings are the same as the Corporation.

4938. And you have pressure enabling you to extinguish fires?—The pressure is from seventy to eighty pounds to the square inch.

4939. Then you don't need fire engines?—No fire engines. We have upwards of 480 yards of hose. We have two jets, in fact.

4940. As regards the question of wear and tear of the roads, is there a considerable traffic—a large traffic I may say—over the Pembroke roads, from which the

DUBLIN
May 29, 1879.
Mr. A. H.
Roberts

Pembroke township gains no benefit?—There is. The district of Rochestown, outside us, draws all its supplies from the city through the township.

4941. Do provisions from the city to districts outside pass through your township?—Certainly.

4942. We have heard already that a great deal of building stones come from outside the township; does any of that traffic pass through it?—The greater portion of the building stone—the granite—comes from the Dublin mountains. The black stone from Skerries, the quarry stone from Kildare. The sand is raised in the township; the lime is burned in the township, and the bricks are delivered in Ringwood Roads to a great extent.

4943. Mr. HERSEY.—That is for Pembroke township?—For Pembroke township.

4944. CHAIRMAN.—Surely the stones for the repair of buildings in Dublin don't go through your township?—I did not say so.

4945. Mr. ANDREWS.—Are commodities sent through your township?—We have Guinness's drays and brewers' drays constantly on our roads, bringing barrels of porter to the outlying districts, and taking back the empty barrels with them.

4946. Does that apply also to vans that convey bakers' and grocers' goods?—It does—all the bakers' vans of Dublin traverse our township.

4947. For places beyond it?—Yes.

4948. According to the experience you have had, and your knowledge of the improvements made in the township, what would the effect of annexation be?—Well, unquestionably, if it were carried out it would be very serious to the township. It would retard the general progress, and prejudice the rights of owners of property. The increase of taxation which would be consequent upon annexation would stop building in the township.

4949. You have had a good opportunity of learning the feelings of the ratepayers on the subject; can you tell the Commissioners whether it is favourable or opposed to annexation?—Quite opposed to it.

4950. As regards nuisances, did your Board, a considerable time ago, make an order with reference to the reporting and removal of nuisances?—There were some complaints, and in order to have more vigilance used; this order was put on the books:—

"That in the event of any nuisance being reported by the sub-inspector officer, or members of the Metropolitan Police force, as existing on any of the public ways within the township, the surveyor do have it removed without delay."

That order was made in July, 1876.

4951. Has it since been attended to?—It has.

4952. With regard to the lanes through the township, was there any order as to them?—Yes; there is an order of the 3rd December, 1877, on the books. There were some complaints respecting them, and this order was made:—

"That, on the report of the sub-inspector officer, of any lane under the jurisdiction of the Commissioners being in want of removing, the same be soverened, and the title removed without delay."

4953. Are you yourself personally acquainted with the working of these sanitary arrangements in Pembroke township?—Yes; the two sub-inspector officers attend at the office every morning to receive instructions as to letters and reports; and they are bound to report to me daily as to their previous day's work, and do so each morning. They also furnish a fortnightly report.

4954. Do you yourself go through the district?—Yes, occasionally, to see that they are doing their duty. I have here a return framed with the view of being made perfectly aware as to whether they were performing their duty or not. It has been in existence since 1875. It gives a perfect history of each case. On a case arising in which a complaint is made, the inspectors are bound to enter it on this sheet; and the various stages it goes through are also entered, so that

DURHAM
May 22, 1878.
Mr. A. H.
Rathbone.

at any time I can tell the proceedings which have taken place with regard to any entry on the sheet.

4955. Are you able to say, from the knowledge you have of the district, whether it is well attended to as to sanitary matters or not—I believe it to be fairly attended to.

4956. Is the scavenging done as well as in other localities?—Well, we are second to none in that respect.

4957. What is the state of general repair in which your roads and thoroughfares are kept—I think they are very fair.

4958. Has any order been put on the books for some time with reference to a map showing the directions of your drains and sewers?—Yes, this order has been put on the books. There had been maps kept, but in order to comply with the section of the statute the sanitary authorities made the following order—

"That the surveyor do furnish a proper map showing the course and direction of all the sewers in the township, and private connections with same, also manholes in each, and furnish a book of reference to said map, containing the capacity of each sewer, its distance from line of bank, and depth from surface."

The date of that order is the 6th of November, 1876.

4959. CHAIRMAN.—Has that been done since?—It has.

Cross-examined by Dr. Norwood.

4960. What staff have you engaged upon scavenging work?—About thirty-seven.

4961. Does that staff attend to the repairs as well as to the cleansing and scavenging of the roads?—They are the road-men; they attend to the maintenance and the scavenging both.

4962. Do you contract for your horses?—We have our own horses, and when we find that they are not sufficient we contract for others.

4963. How many horses have you?—Seven at present; we had nine.

4964. Have you been here for the last two or three days?—I have.

4965. Are there any leases which are not in charge of the Commissioners?—There are a great many.

4966. Do you make any difference with regard to those in the case of nuisances arising in them?—We do, decidedly.

4967. What difference?—We make the owners of leases not in charge of the Commissioners take charge of them, and cleanse them when required.

4968. You don't neglect them for two years or abscond them?—Certainly not.

4969. If there be a nuisance there do you look after it?—If there be a nuisance there we make the owner remove it.

4970. CHAIRMAN.—You do it under the General Act?—We have done so since 1865.

4971. Have you done it since 1866?—Yes.

4972. The only reason I ask you is on account of the notion that appears to exist in Rathbone's—

4973. Dr. Norwood.—Have the maps been from time to time corrected, showing all the sewers and private drains in the new roads?—Oh, no; I did not say private drains and connections. Not in every instance, but a great number of them are.

4974. Have you books showing the amount of scavenging done on the different roads?—Yes.

4975. I merely wish to know have you them?—As you have raised the question, I will be very glad to show you. This is the form which has been in use in the township for a considerable period. It shows the number of men and horses employed; the quantity of road material put out, and the quantity of road scavenging removed. It also gives the names of the various roads which have been scavenged, and of those on which material has been put out. Now, the township is divided into four districts, and the return before me

is dated 8th of May, 1878. It shows the number of loads of road scarpings removed from the Sandymount district to be thirty-one; and the number of loads of road material put out—eleven.

4976. Is that a weekly return?—Yes; it is a return submitted to the committee every Friday. We have here details of where the loads were put out, and where the scarpings were removed from.

4977. CHAIRMAN.—Have you a yard and a store clerk to keep an account of what comes in and goes out?—We have. This is a return prepared by the yard clerk, and certified by the surveyor.

4978. Have you an overseer besides?—Yes. This return is only a fortnight old. Of course there is a good deal of trouble in keeping this account, but there can be no deception. (Reads) Sandymount; Ringsend; Haddington-road, and Donnybrook districts. There are the names of every road and lane, and of lanes at the ends of roads, and so on; and there is a regular return of the number of men and horses employed, and of the quantity of road scarpings removed, and of road material put out; of the quantity of sand for pathways put out; of refuse removed, and so on; and the total is brought forward regularly every week.

4979. And then, I suppose, the clerk is able to check the quantity of sand and stone that he ought to have?—He has only to turn to his book, and he can tell you at any period the quantity put out.

4980. Do you check this every week?—Certainly.

4981. And lay it before your road committee every week?—Certainly.

4982. Is it checked over and examined by your committee every week?—It comes before them in a certified form from the surveyor, and I look over it and examine it also.

4983. Dr. Norwood.—Are your 480 yards of hose in good order and repair?—400 are, but I won't speak of the eighty. The 400 could not be better.

4984. And they are efficient?—Quite efficient.

4985. CHAIRMAN.—Does the consulting sanitary officer attend your meetings?—He does; our fortnightly meetings.

4986. Dr. Norwood.—I believe your township is somewhat similar in the character of its inhabitants and houses to that of Rathbone?—I think we have a larger population than Rathbone, and a greater number of houses, but I did not take the figures.

4987. You have two hospitals within your district?—We have three within our district. One of them is a recent establishment—a religious order.

4988. Does your Board contribute anything to their support?—During the outbreak of epidemics they have.

4989. Is there an annual contribution?—No.

4990. Do you sacrifice anything towards the hospitals of the city?—We do, I should say; for instance, if you look at the County Grand Jury Blue Book you will find a very large contribution under the head of county charges, and we have to pay our proportion of that.

4991. These are the county hospitals, not the city?—I don't think we send anyone to the city hospitals.

4992. Mr. Heron.—How much do you give to the county?—Well, in the County Grand Jury Book, for the year 1877, there is £10,000 charged to the county at large. We pay our proportion of that. It is for industrial schools, County of Dublin Infirmary, and Meath Hospital, reformatory, gaols, and lunatic asylums.

4993. County at large charges?—Yes.

4994. How much do you pay of that?—I have not calculated what the per capita rate would be.

4995. CHAIRMAN.—I think Mr. Vernon said it was 10d. last year.

4996. Mr. Heron.—We pay about 5d. in the pound.

4997. Dr. Norwood.—You have 360 lamps in the district?—Yes.

5007. Have you any means of testing the quality of the gas?—Yes.

5018. Have you an officer?—The gas we receive comes from the same gasometer as that used in the city, and consequently it must be of the same quality.

5019. Have you any officer who tests pressure?—We don't need to test it.

5020. Then you rely on the testing in Dublin?—No, we do not rely on the testing in Dublin, but on the government officer, Dr. Tickborne.

5021. Mr. Andrews.—Was he appointed under the Act of 1874?—Yes; for the gas district, which extends to our township.

5022. Do you pay anything towards his salary?—I don't know that we pay anything directly.

5023. Mr. Walker.—The Board of Trade appoint him.

5024. Dr. Norwood (*to witness*).—You have no separate gas tester?—We don't need one.

5025. CHAIRMAN.—If they paid for a separate one it would be throwing away public money.

5026. Mr. Walker.—It would be disallowed by the auditor.

5027. Dr. Norwood.—Are there any private roads in your township?—I mean not in charge of the Commissioners?—Yes.

5028. Have you a list of them?—I think I can tell you.

5029. I don't want to know: have you a list of them?—I have.

5030. You could put your finger on any of them at any moment?—I could.

5031. CHAIRMAN.—I see by a return that you have paid for the removal of patients under the Contagious Diseases Act?—We have; by the Act we are obliged to pay for all paupers.

5032. You have exercised the power of removal under the Act?—Certainly.

5033. Is there a poorer population in your district than in Rathmines?—Well, I don't know that they are poorer; I don't think they are.

5034. Is there enough to do for two sub-sanitary officers in your district, along with your two officers of health and consulting sanitary officer?—Certainly.

5035. Are they engaged on that work all day?—Yes; during the hours limited by statute.

5036. During which they have power to enter those places?—Quite so.

5037. Have you any of these persons employed as hall porters?—Certainly not.

5038. Have you a disinfecting chamber?—No; it is not compulsory to have one; but the Commissioners, if necessary, are prepared to erect such, and to provide all necessary conveniences.

5039. Mr. Andrews.—Have you a conveyance for patients?—We have, and would be very happy to lend it to the Corporation; if we send it over I think they will find it is far superior to anything of the kind they have got.

5040. CHAIRMAN.—Do you find that it takes that staff of thirty-seven men with a number of horses, and hired horses on emergency, to keep the township in fair order?—Yes.

5041. Even with the roads as well made as they have been by Mr. Vernon?—Yes.

5042. Is there any thoroughfare in the township allowed to remain for a week without being scavenged?—I don't think there is. I think the scavenger looks very well after the roads.

5043. Did you ever know of a person wishing to make a complaint, and asking to be allowed to go before the Board, and being refused permission to do so?—Never. Persons are always admitted on calling in their cards, and announcing that they are in waiting.

5044. How long do you find that it takes you, as a rule, at each fortnightly meeting to transact the

business of the Board?—The Board assemble at eleven o'clock, and they sometimes sit up to half-past one o'clock.

5045. Have you a sanitary committee?—Yes. It meets, on the termination of the business of the general Board, every fortnight.

5046. Do you submit to them returns of what has been done in the meantime—complaints, and so on?—Yes; and they make orders accordingly.

5047. In your accounts which do not go before the public auditor, but are auditied by two gentlemen, you have separate heads for "curbing," "channels," "crossings," "pathways," "yard and stables," "watering the roads;" a horse account under the head of "fodder," "bedding," "shoeing;" "carters' wages," "hired horses," and every single thing—not lumping them altogether, as is done in Rathmines!—Yes; the various accounts are all kept separate.

5048. I think it fair to make one remark. I have travelled over a great many places in Ireland with my colleagues, and this I must say, that I never saw better accounts in any town we were in than those of the Pembroke Town Commissioners; nor did I ever see a larger amount of scavenging work recorded. Everything is put down, and the accounts are kept in such a way that it can be seen instantly whether the business of the township is attended to or not. I say this because people may think that I have been rather hard in the observations that I made about Rathmines. What salaries do you pay your two sub-officers?—One has 30s. a week and the other 21s.; and we pay our disinfector 18s. per week.

5049. And the overseer?—He has £2 a week.

5050. Do they give you their undivided time?—Yes; from six o'clock in the morning until six in the evening. I might mention that the editor of the *Freeman's Journal* complimented the township on being the first to put in force the powers given under the Sanitary Act of 1878.

5051. You wanted very little then. You appear to have got the Act all in force before that. I understand that Mr. Vernon is able to say of his own knowledge that all the gentlemen of the Board of Commissioners of Pembroke Township are distinctly of opinion that it would not be for the benefit of the township to be annexed to the city!

Mr. Andrews.—That is entirely so.

5052. CHAIRMAN.—Therefore, as far as we are concerned, I don't see the necessity for examining the gentlemen I see here. If they are unanimous of that opinion, we will take it that such is their opinion.

5053. Mr. Walker.—If you will have it taken down on the notes?

5054. CHAIRMAN.—Most distinctly. Mr. Walker, it is only adopting the courses we adopted at almost every other place. We generally took the Town Clerk, and asked him if he was authorized to speak on behalf of the Board; and if he said he was we asked the Chairman if he induced his opinion. In some places we found that the Board were not unanimous, and then we thought it right to take the individual opinions of the members. If Mr. Vernon states that he is authorized by his Board to say that as a body they object to annexation, we will take that to be the expression of opinion of all the body; and it will not be strengthened by examining Mr. Meade or Mr. Mayers. But don't think that I want to prevent you from examining them.

5055. Mr. Andrews.—Quite the contrary. The interests involved are too important; and I know the Commissioners have allowed everything that is necessary; but with that intimation if you will be kind enough to make a note—

5056. CHAIRMAN.—If you choose you can ask them have they heard the statement of Mr. Vernon, and do they agree to it.

DEBATES.
May 22, 1881.

Mr. A. H.
Robinson.

DUBLIN,
May 31, 1878.

Dr. E. P.
Wright.

Dr. E. P. Wright, examined by Mr. Walker, Q.C.

5037. You are a member of the Town Commissioners of Pembroke?—Yes.

5038. And your father is the owner of property theretofore?—Yes.

5039. You are a member of the Works and Finance Committee?—Yes.

5040. You have heard the evidence of Mr. Vernon?—Yes.

5041. And do you endorse the evidence he gave?—So far as the facts go, yes. I could not say that I would be responsible for everything he said.

5042. CHAIRMAN.—You do not think that it would be desirable for the inhabitants of Pembroke to be annexed?—No, it would be most unfortunate.

5043. Even if the taxation was the same—or if it was not materially increased, say more than 5d. or 6d. t—Even if it was left as it is, we have enough to

do; we know our own wants and needs, and have come through many a hard battle.

5044. Mr. Heron.—We were going to examine Dr. Wright as to the sanitary question.

5045. Dr. Wright.—As a matter of fact, we are in a transitory period; we are changing from cess-pools to sewers, and are taking time to do it. We had a report that a person who kept pigs near the Beggar-street bridge, kept the cabbage leaves so long as to be offensive, and we sent to have it removed.

5046. CHAIRMAN.—You thought that a nuisance?—Yes. A nuisance means something you don't like.

5047. Mr. Heron.—Matter in the wrong place.

5048. Dr. Wright.—That is dirt.

5049. CHAIRMAN.—When were you elected?—I was co-opted first in 1873, and was elected at the next election. I was not elected in 1878, but I was co-opted on Mr. Boyce's death.

Mr. Michael
Means, J.P.

Mr. MICHAEL MEANS, J.P., examined by Mr. Andrews.

5050. You are an extensive builder and contractor?—Yes.

5051. You reside in Pembroke Township—on the Aylesbury-road?—Yes.

5052. In the Merkin district?—Yes.

5053. You have large premises adjoining the Wicklow Railway?—Yes.

5054. And are a large ratepayer in the city?—Yes.

5055. You have a large property in the township, and are a Pembroke Commissioner as well?—Yes.

5056. How much money, may I ask you, have you laid out in the township?—£90,000 during the last twelve years.

5057. Would you have spent it if you were aware that the township was going to be annexed?—No.

5058. Shortly, give your view as to this question of annexation?—Well, with regard to Pembroke Board, I myself am there about eighty days in the year, and I take as great an interest in Pembroke as anyone could possibly do. I watch it very closely as I pass through it, and I consider there is no township in this or any other country can be better managed.

5059. Are the inhabitants so unreasonable as to be dissatisfied?—Oh, no; they are quite satisfied.

5060. Now, as you have a large experience of the matter, I would ask you as to the stone used in

Dublin; you are aware that some of our large public buildings necessitate the bringing in of a large quantity of stone?—Yes, I have used a great deal in the Four Courts during the last twenty years.

5061. Yes, we know the new Record buildings, for instance?—A great deal of it came from Ballyknocken. There was half a million of tons or so, I suppose, used for the new Police Court.

5062. Do they not come over your township?—Of course—through both Redlinnes and Pembroke.

5063. You know the improvements being effected at the South City Markets?—Yes.

5064. Where are they taking the stone?—Well, £7,000 is what the excavation comes to, and it is brought to Dounybrook quarry.

5065. And in tonnage what is it?—Well, it would be rather hard to say; I should go into a calculation for that.

5066. CHAIRMAN.—Suppose the Corporation were to improve, would you then be in favour of annexation?—No.

5067. Would your body come in to improve them?—Well, I don't know that our body would be for coming in at all.

5068. Mr. Heron.—Why don't you annex Dublin?—I should be very sorry to disturb Dublin. I have a great interest in Dublin.

Mr. George Motter, M.A., examined.

5069. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—You are a Commissioner of the Pembroke Township?—Yes.

5070. And you also have the advantage of being a member of the Town Council?—Yes.

5071. Have you property yourself in Pembroke?—Yes, I have.

5072. Do you want to be annexed?—Well, no; I do not want to be annexed, strictly speaking; if I could see that by lessening the taxation in the city by the annexation, I would be lessening the taxation in the township, I might, but I can't see that that would be the result, and, on the whole, I am totally and entirely opposed to it.

5073. Are matters well managed in Pembroke?—As nearly perfect as possible.

5074. Is the administrative management of the revenue placed in their hands?—I should say, Mr. Chairman, that the Corporation labour under great difficulties which Pembroke do not labour under, and I think there is a great deal to be said in excuse of their shortcomings; but to contrast the management of the Corporation with that of the Pembroke Town-

ship Commissioners—well, I don't think it would look quite as good.

5075. CHAIRMAN.—You have sixty members of the Corporation to manage a quarter of a million, and fifteen members of the Town Commissioners to manage only £25,000, and new property without much of a pauper element?—Yes, we have in the township a better state of affairs to work on.

5076. Do you think it would be cheaper to have one governing body, suppose it to be a good one like Pembroke, with a fire brigade, good scavenging staff, an engineer, paid a proper salary, with two or three assistants, instead of having an independent engineer in each township?—No, I do not. I think, as a rule, things may be centralized, and perhaps economized, but I don't think that would apply in this case. I think you would have an increase of staff necessary for working the township, and there would be no economy in the long run.

5077. In England I see one of the arguments has been that in such places as Liverpool, Manchester, and Leeds, instead of having independent bodies around, the townships are better managed by having one

central complete staff—an engineer of acknowledged ability, with a good salary, and two or three superintendents or assistants, and different overseers to carry out the work. The opinion there prevails that there would be economy by all being worked under one staff. That is said in England—but to a certain extent that applies; if applied within certain limits concentration is economical and desirable, but, on the other hand, there is nothing so dangerous as monopoly; and I think a little wholesome comparison between us is calculated to invite them to do their work better.

5078. If the Corporation staff were so increased as to enable you to have the townships worked by it what would you say?—Well, after all you would be only transferring one account to the other.

5079. It has been stated, and no one can speak on the subject with greater authority than you, that the artisan population of the township is drawn entirely from Dublin—that all the carpenters, bricklayers, and plumbers that execute works in the townships go into the city, and live and die there!—Well, within our own township we have in Ringsend, Irishtown, and Donnybrook a fair share of artisans' dwellings; but I don't know if it is so in Rathmines. I can't see the great injury to the city on account of artisans living in the city—quite the reverse, for they earn their money in the township, and spend it in the city.

Mr. JOHN HOGAN, examined.

5080. CHAIRMAN.—Do you live in the Penhollow township?—I do; I have some property there.

5081. Are you in favour of annexation?—Well, I want to give evidence as to the bad state—the bad sanitary state of the lower end of the township, not the fashionable, but the lower, end, at Tritonville and Irishtown. Nothing could be worse. There is a pestilential stench there that is most offensive—the Dodder.

5082. But they are going to improve all that, you know?—All I can say is there is no such stench in the world than is to be found at the outfall down by London Bridge-road to the Dodder—it is worse than the Liffey. I must say that I never knew before I heard Mr. Robinson's evidence about the sanitary officers that they had such a staff.

5083. CHAIRMAN.—But they say they have it!—Well, they must be asleep. I never saw anything worse than the way in which the district to which I am alluding has been left, with night soil and all kinds of filth; in fact, I don't think that Bathavenue and London Bridge-road has had one penny spent on it, and it is an important place.

5084. Mr. Heron.—The trans have, no doubt, done something for it!—Yes; but for the trans I don't know what would have become of it. As the fashionable part is well attended to. They commenced an avenue there and never finished it. The footways are in a very bad state.

5085. CHAIRMAN.—Did you ever write about it?—I did.

5086. About the footways?—Yes.

5087. And what was the result?—They said that there was an engineering difficulty about it.

5088. Now, Mr. Robinson, what do you say to that?

Mr. Hogan.—Wherever the Commissioners live they take care of, no doubt.

5089. Mr. Hogan.—Is there any sanitary inspector at Irishtown?—I never knew of it till I went to Mr. Robinson about the vice of my house.

5090. Do you know the foreshore along at the Roman Catholic chapel?—Yes.

5091. Are there not very bad smells there?—Yes, sometimes; but I do not think that is so bad at all, if they would clean the Dodder.

5092. CHAIRMAN.—Is it not all to be stopped going into the Dodder?

Mr. Hogan.—But the people will be all dead before

5093. Mr. Walker.—Are not the artisans you speak of employed at the North Wall?—Yes.

5094. And they cross the ferry?—Yes.

5095. And sleep in your township?—Yes; as I say I can't see the disadvantage of the artisans working in the townships and living in the city, for they spend their wages in Dublin, pay rent there, and so on. The same may be said of the better class residents. As a rule these people reside only for health sake in the townships. They make and spend their money in the town. As to the question of the traffic over the roads, I think the balance is altogether against Dublin, for anything in the shape of material comes in from the townships.

5096. CHAIRMAN.—Not timber?—Well, no; but relatively that is in weight nothing—timber and stones would be nothing compared with stone, brick, and sand.

5097. DR. NORTWOOD.—What do you say to coal?—No doubt coal is an important article of consumption.

5098. There are, say, 3,222 houses in Penhollow; don't they consume five tons a year each?—Yes; but take the instance that Mr. Meade mentioned—take the case of the city markets, 3,000,000 tons of rubbish, 2,000,000 yards of combustion! it is a marvel to everybody how it is to be done. We are going to be educated by some of our Scotch friends.

May 23, 1873.
Mr. George
Hogan, M.A.

Mr. John
Hogan.

that takes place. In the meantime some of the dirt might be removed at the proper season.

5099. I am certain that if you go to Mr. Robinson whatever you will be attended to.

5100. Oh, sir, they don't pay any attention to complaints unless they come from persons who happen to have the good fortune to live in the "fash" parts of it.

5101. MR. ANDREW.—Is there not a scheme of drainage in process?—Yes.

5102. You had means of knowing it?—Yes.

5103. Is a matter of compensation?—Yes.

5104. Had you any difference about a drain of your own?—Yes, when they called in an engineer, and I asked him to take the surface water off the road—

5105. Do you know Mr. Fallon and Mr. Murphy?—He is not a Commissioner.

5106. Don't they look after that district?—I never saw him in the neighbourhood.

5107. MR. HERON.—Do you live at Bathavenue?—At Tritonville. I have some houses there. That end of the township is totally neglected as to footways and roadways. The other part is attended to. It is the most partially managed place.

5108. MR. MEADE.—All I can say is that Irishtown has got more attention than any other portion in proportion.

5109. MR. HOGAN.—Yes; wherever there is a Commissioner's house there is special attention paid it.

5110. MR. WALKER.—What trouble are you in?—A bullock.

5111. CHAIRMAN.—I am sure, unless they are very partial indeed, that they will do for you what they do for the others. They have done an enormous amount of sanitary work, judging from the statements we have received to-day.

5112. MR. HOGAN.—It is only on paper, sir. I never knew there were so many offices. It is only by accident I knew of it. I had to go to the police office to prosecute a man myself.

5113. MR. MEADE.—I may mention that £150 has been spent on the footpaths at London-bridge within the past three months, and we are putting down new curbing.

5114. MR. HOGAN.—It must have been since yesterday evening.

5115. CHAIRMAN.—They are all beginning to mend their ways, and I am sure the Corporation will begin to be more active in sanitary matters.

The Inquiry adjourned to next morning at eleven o'clock.

DUBLIN.
May 22, 1879.

DUBLIN—ELEVENTH DAY, MAY 23RD, 1879.

Mr. Andrews.—I don't know, sir, whether it would be convenient—it would be very convenient to a good many of us, and I think to my friend, Mr. White, as well, who appears for the railway company—if we knew whether the Pembroke case was closed or not.

Chairman.—I don't know if anyone is coming from Pembroke; I don't see anyone here.

Mr. Andrews.—I think there is no one here but the railway company.

Chairman.—You can deal with that to-morrow, when the other railways are on.

Mr. Cotton.—There is only one other railway company, practically, in Killineyism. I don't think the Great Northern is appearing still.

Mr. Andrews.—But it is only inasmuch as the Wicklow Company is connected with the Pembroke branch of the inquiry, and it would be very convenient if that was disposed of now.

Chairman.—If you would both rather go on now do so.

Mr. Andrews.—We would; it would be a great convenience.

Chairman.—I speak to Mr. Fitzgerald just now, about one matter connected with Pembroke. On going through the accounts handed to us yesterday I find that the three shilling rate, exclusive of the drainage rate for last year, produced so much. And I find at the result of the financial year that they owed over £2,300. If that be so it would have taken very nearly a further threepenny rate to enable them to have a clear balance sheet at the end of the year. I requested him to ask Mr. Robinson how that was, or Mr. Vernon will be able himself to say.

Mr. Andrews.—We will have that done.

Chairman.—Very well. We have received this morning an anonymous communication from someone styling himself or herself, as the case may be, "An Inhabitant of Belgrave Square, Rathmines," but we can take no notice of anonymous communications. If the party chooses to come forward to mention what is in the letter we will hear him, but if not we cannot.

Mr. Keogh excused.

5116. **Mr. Piers White, Q.C.**—Mr. Keogh, you are the Solicitor of the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company?—Yes.

5117. They were rated occupiers in the City of Dublin for two terminal buildings I—Yes, for Harcourt-street and Westland-row, and some extensive works.

5118. They are also rated in Rathmines and Pembroke?—Yes.

5119. What is the rating in Pembroke?—£16,216 out of the entire, which is one-eighth of the entire.

5120. **Chairman.**—Is that separated into buildings and land?—Yes; £10,603 in land, and £1,24, buildings in Pembroke.

5121. **Mr. White.**—Is not your railway rated to the extent of five-sixths, instead of the usual one-fourth in other townships?—For all except the new drainage.

5122. With reference to the new drainage—you have got the one-fourth rate principle applied?—Yes.

5123. **Chairman.**—In Rathmines how much is it?—It is comparatively small. Under the old Act of 1847 the railway company may object to annexation in Dublin.

5124. Suppose, now, that the land to receive your five-sixths was only changed, how are your company interested then?—We are interested because we conceive to—

5125. **Mr. Heron.**—Who are "we"?—My clients.

Mr. White.—I asked that question for a particular reason, that I might be a position to find a certain argument on it, which you will presently hear.

5126. **Mr. Cotton.**—How does the railway pay for the portion in the City of Dublin?—They pay the full rates.

5127. **Mr. Heron.**—How much are you rated for in Dublin?—I have not the figures now.

5128. Is it £10,000?—I cannot tell.

5129. **Chairman.**—If your valuation is very high in Dublin it might be advantageous to you to be annexed, because a reduction in the rates there might be a material advantage to you?—My clients do not take that view.

5130. **Mr. Heron.**—Is that the reason for the delay in the holding of the Westland-row session?—It is being built as fast as it can.

5131. **Dr. Norwood.**—Will it take 25 years?—No, sir. We have done more in 25 years than the Corporation of Dublin has done in twice the time.

5132. **Mr. White.**—Now, sir, I represent a company managed by a Board of Directors, and they are the largest ratepayers not only in Dublin, but in the town-

ship of Pembroke, and I need not tell you that they are deeply interested in the welfare not only of the city but of both the townships. And I think, sir, as you intimated when this Commission opened the inquiry, that you would hear the views of independent ratepayers, you should hear our views, because at the present moment, as it appears to me, you have got at one side the views which are put forward by the Corporation of Dublin, who are really the promoters of this scheme, and the other views put forward by the Commissioners, who are resisting it. Now, sir, every ratepayer—and my clients particularly, as a large company—has a certain interest, what may be called an individual or private interest, to consult when they regard the admissibility or prudence of a question of this sort. But these private interests are generally found to be consonant with the public interest and welfare, and I think the expressed opinion of private individuals is particularly valuable where the scheme proposed for adoption by Parliament is one which is really propounded by the Corporation of Dublin from motives which are scarcely concealed. Now, sir, it is all very fine for gentlemen like Mr. Fox, selected spokesman of Dublin, to propose here a scheme for a sort of ideal municipality, one which should be perfect, and should supply the city with a perfect system of water, perfect abattoirs, perfect fire escapes, perfect fire brigades, and police. But what you have to deal with is practical suggestions, and not to make recommendations as if you were making them anterior to the establishment of the townships, and before the townships had procured a status by Act of Parliament. It is not a question of extending the City of Dublin into rural districts already incorporated by other corporate bodies, such as the Commissioners of Pembroke and Rathmines, but the whole scheme propounded by the Corporation is one which essentially tends to overturn vested rights, rights vested in these bodies by Act of the Legislature. And that being so, it seems to me to follow unavoidably that unless you see convincing and overwhelming reasons for recommending the scheme proposed by the Corporation, I say the scheme must fail. Let us see what those reasons are, and of course I need not remind you and your brother Commissioner that I am not here to repeat anything you have heard from Mr. Walker, but my clients, the company I represent, fully adopt and endorse his arguments on behalf of the Commissioners of Pembroke. We accede to every one of them; we thank you are founded in common sense,

and we adopt them. All I will trouble you with are a few reasons which occur to me as independent taxpayers. It occurs to me to ask if you can have any doubt on your minds with reference to the motives which dictate the action of the Corporation before you? It would be absurd to suppose that any rational person in the City of Dublin imagines that the corporate action has been undertaken from any motive such as to extend to those townships the benefit of the corporate administration which the City of Dublin already enjoys. The motive of the Corporation is scarcely concealed, because it is obvious from the drift of the evidence that their real object and motive is to acquire additional corporate funds to enable them to carry out their administration of the city affairs in a way which they think will be more advantageous; and it certainly struck me, while I was here listening to the evidence, that there is a considerable amount of inconsistency and what I may call want of candour in some of the evidence given by corporate witnesses and officers, because at the very time that it is obvious their motive is to acquire additional funds, they at the same time ask you to believe that their financial affairs are in a perfectly sound state, and they suggest that their motive is not to acquire additional funds, but to bring in these townships that they may participate in the advantages of the financial blessings which the City of Dublin already enjoys. Does anyone imagine that that is a frank statement of what the corporate officials are at when they ask you to make this recommendation to Parliament? It occurs to me that if you want a test of the candour and the honesty, of the corporate proposition it is afforded by the case of Clontarf. It is suggested, indeed, that the present municipal boundary is inconvenient; that it would be much more reasonable and much more systematical, as Mr. Gray appears to think, that this township should be thrown in, and that they should have a common and more satisfactory frontier or boundary. Now, look to the condition of Clontarf, which they do not propose to bring in. Why? Because it was insolvent, and the Corporation knew they could not expect to get £1 more of revenue by the annexation of Clontarf. The only shadow of reason or argument which seemed to me to have any substance about it is this—that the inhabitants of the suburban townships make use of the roads and streets of Dublin without paying for them. Now, let us make use of that with regard to Clontarf. If there be any township surrounding Dublin the whole traffic of which is concentrated in the streets of Dublin it is Clontarf. You will find that the inhabitants of Clontarf are concentrated at one point for ingress and egress into the city, and if that be so for what possible reason can the Corporation seek to exclude them from this arrangement? If the whole traffic of the township be concentrated at Ballybough-brige coming in from the North Strand I am at a loss to understand why they should not pay for the use of the streets and roads. But while I use that argument I merely use it for the purpose of showing that it is a foolish thing to imagine that the Corporation here have any practical object in view beyond that single one of grasping, if they can, an additional revenue by the annexation of the townships, provided they are solvent, but if one be insolvent, the Corporation will have nothing to say to it. So much for the objects of the Corporation in the promotion of this scheme, and I will say a few words on what appears to be the ground and arguments by which they seek to support it. I admit that objects and motives are only secondary considerations if there be any reasons for promoting such a scheme, but it seems to me, attending here for several days and listening to witnesses, that I have not often heard a novel proposition supported by a series of more plausible reasons and arguments than I heard in this room. Now, what are the reasons which are assigned? I stated already that one argument did strike me at first as being a feasible one, which had some appearance and show of reason in it, and that is the argument that persons who reside in the neighbour-

hood of Dublin and daily use its streets should be liable to contribute to the maintenance of the roads and streets, to the wear and tear of which they also contribute. I will deal with that presently, but putting that aside, I did not hear in this room a single argument which did not strike me as being possible of a ready and easy answer. The Corporation suggest that if the township be incorporated the new administration, under the reformed Corporation or the amalgamated Corporation, would be in a position to supply the township with improved water, improved drainage, improved gas, shanters, and one or two other imaginary advantages. What strikes me about this is that the townships are already in a position to provide themselves with these improvements if they want them, and are actually in process of providing some of them for themselves. The Corporation of Dublin is a body which is somewhat unpopular; I don't wish to give in to the usual popular antipathy with which they have been regarded; I think there is a good deal of force in what fell from Mr. Pin, that within the last few years the constitution of the Corporation has been improved and things are somewhat better than they have been; but I do think that if you have in your minds, as you must have, appreciated the administrative merits of the Corporation of Dublin and the governing bodies of the townships, you cannot hesitate for a moment to come to the conclusion that the administration of the townships has up to the present been conducted in a much more satisfactory manner than the administration of the city of Dublin. I heard some startling things in this room; I heard Mr. Alderman Harris state that the streets of Dublin he considered to be in a satisfactory state of convenience. I say matters like those are gross exaggerations, for no one who lives in Dublin can be unaware of the fact, that in point of cleanliness and health, Dublin is almost a by-word among the cities of the United Kingdom, if not in Europe. You have only to look to the report of the Committee of the House of Commons which has originated this Commission. I admit that they did one good thing in their time—the Vauxhall water has been introduced into the city of Dublin by the energy of a gentleman who is unfortunately no longer amongst us; with that exception their administration has been a failure. On the other hand, I say the administration of the townships has been most successful; I don't say anybody is perfect, but if you want to test whether or not great advantages are likely to result to the townships from this system of amalgamation, I will ask you to consider the drainage question for the last few years. This great uncleanliness of Dublin utterly failed. I will not go into the details, it is a matter of anteriority, to do anything with reference to the drainage of Dublin. These townships which are sought to be incorporated with the city of Dublin, in municipal administration set to work to do it for themselves, and they succeeded. Though opposed in Parliament by this very Corporation of Dublin, they succeeded in getting from Parliament powers which enabled them to go to work, and they have at present a splendid scheme of drainage in progress. When you come to ask yourselves what advantages will accrue from this supposed united family, may I ask a question, what earthly prospect is there that the state of things in Penrhyn and Rothmines will be improved when and if they become united to this Corporation? Many absurd things have been urged in this room with reference to the amalgamation of these two bodies; I have never heard them expressed in absurdity. It is said it is a great disadvantage to Penrhyn and Rothmines that the debates of the Commissioners are not reported in the papers. Does any one imagine that this is not an advantage? If people are to meet for public business, the less they are reported the better, and the more they confine themselves to local matters instead of discussing the great public questions of the day, the more local interests will be studied. We heard a great deal about the necessity of abstaining; I am not aware whether, in

DUBLIN,
May 22, 1872.
Mr. Keogh

DUBLIN,
May 23, 1874.
Mr. Keogh.

the true sense of the word, there are any in Dublin, but there are just as many in the townships, and the Commissioners have full powers to erect them, and will erect them according as they find necessary for them. It has been said that several of the streets of Dublin have become dilapidated; that is true—Hanover-street has become dilapidated, and Grenville-street has been deserted, but other streets have arisen which more than compensate. I do not agree with what has been stated by some of the witnesses that Dublin is a decaying city; the contrary is the fact. It is one of the most progressive periods; the public streets are improved, and if some of the houses are dilapidated others are improved, and I do not anticipate, that, on a revaluation of Dublin, whatever that takes place, the valuation will not be increased. We heard also complaints from some gentlemen, Alderman Harris and others, that the gas lights are put out too early in the townships; is that an argument to address to reasonable men? surely the Commissioners have the power to keep them lighted longer if they think necessary without getting the assistance of the Corporation of Dublin.

5133. CHAIRMAN.—I think that was confined to Rathmines, and you can understand how one thing may apply to Rathmines and not to Pembroke.

5134. Mr. White.—But I apprehend the absurdity of the argument is the same. If rational men come here to impress other rational men with their view of the necessity of an amalgamation of the township with the city, it does seem to me absurd to suggest that the Commissioners of Rathmines don't keep the lamps lit at night. One witness was so carried away by his zeal that he complained he was subject to unpleasant uncertainty when going home at night in the Pembroke township. I am not aware that the same temptations do not exist in the city.

5135. CHAIRMAN.—Your observations on the part of the railway company with regard to Pembroke I can understand perfectly, but as far as they are your clients in respect to Rathmines I would like to know what you say. You pay full rates in Rathmines under the Act, but we have this startling fact before us, Rathmines rate is only two shillings in the pound, besides the new drainage rate. In Pembroke it is three shillings. I asked Mr. Vernon some questions about the staff in Rathmines, and he thought it was wholly insufficient. He is the Chairman in Pembroke, and he told us yesterday, with his great knowledge, that in his opinion, the staff of Rathmines is not sufficient for the work. I asked him what he thought of a township, with a large population, in part of which the water was turned off for nine hours every night. He actually shrugged his shoulders at the idea. What do you say for your clients as ratepayers in Rathmines, contrasting with from Pembroke?

Mr. White.—I say that they are ratepayers of Rathmines as well as of the City of Dublin, and that they prefer to remain as they are.

5136. CHAIRMAN.—Would they like to be attached to Pembroke, and give up Rathmines, where there was practically no sanitary work of any sort or kind carried out until the Public Health Act of last year was passed, and whose officers said that they had no power under the previous Public Health Act to do anything for the improvement of the sanitary condition of Rathmines?

Mr. White.—My answer is plain. With reference to the sanitation of Rathmines, did the Corporation do anything for it?

5137. CHAIRMAN.—Of course not; they had no power.

Mr. White.—Did the Commissioners of Rathmines do anything for it?

5138. CHAIRMAN.—They did not until the Public Health Act of last year was passed, and their Secretary declared they thought they had no power. They allowed the previous Acts of Parliament to be a dead letter, and they never did anything.

Mr. White.—Suppose that is so, what is it but that

the township Commissioners of Rathmines were not so active or efficient as they might have been.

5139. CHAIRMAN.—No, but that they were not active or efficient at all.

5140. Mr. White.—Well, take it so for the sake of argument. You have asked me the opinion of my clients in reference to Rathmines. You state, and the evidence tells me, that the Commissioners were quiescent and took no steps for several years. My answer is plain—my clients are not dealing with the past, but with the present, and they say, "We have greater confidence in the administration of the Commissioners of Rathmines than we would have under the Corporation of Dublin," and I will tell you why, because we find the Corporation of Dublin never did anything, not only for the drainage of the township of Rathmines, but for the City of Dublin, notoriously the most filthy city in the United Kingdom, a city in which there is a nuisance that would not be permitted to exist in any civilized city in the world—that is the Liffey.

5141. CHAIRMAN.—There is one river that bears it out, the Blackstaff, at Belfast.

Mr. White.—I never saw it, sir.

5142. Mr. Heron.—Or you never were on the Spree, in Berlin?

5143. Dr. Norwood.—The Dodder, at Rathmines, would beat it, too.

5144. Mr. White.—I have been in many cities on the continent, and speaking of the back streets of Dublin, I say, for scandal little, they are not to be paralleled. I say my clients are justified in arguing from the past even, though as you say the Commissioners may not have been as active as they might have been, but what are they doing now? They have gone to Parliament and carried in the tenth of the Corporation of Dublin a magnificent drainage scheme. The Corporation of Dublin were talking about it and pottering about it for years, and they never did anything to alleviate that abominable nuisance of the river Liffey.

5145. CHAIRMAN.—Are you aware the Corporation propose to pay two-thirds of the expense of your drainage?

Mr. White.—They proposed many things, but they never carried them out.

5146. CHAIRMAN.—They now propose in effect to pay about two-thirds of what that main drainage will cost, and they will not get any benefit from it.

5147. Mr. White.—Surely there cannot be a more fallacious argument. Rathmines and Pembroke are subject to a heavy debt for their own scheme. What Dublin proposes is that "We will carry out at some future time a scheme, and we will amalgamate all the debt."

5148. CHAIRMAN.—That may not follow, because when they propose it you or other persons can be heard as to whether that is a proper thing.

5149. Mr. White.—Their proposition appears to me never to have been definitely fixed, because Mr. Fox, who was about one of the best witnesses they produced, told you he had not laid out in his own mind any scheme in preference to another, as to the principle on which the two bodies should be amalgamated, and, therefore, the whole scheme is before you in a perfectly crude shape. You may shape out in your own mind what you think would be a reasonable arrangement.

5150. CHAIRMAN.—The way that occurred was this: I asked Mr. Fox if he had considered the Corporation proposition, which I understood to be, "Let the Corporation and townships be on equal terms; we propose to throw all our city estate and all our rates and taxes into a common fund along with yours, and out of that common fund to pay everything," that is, your £100,000 for the two townships' main drainage is to go as a debt on the city rates and property. If there was a revaluation Dublin should be valued up to £300,000, and Rathmines and Pembroke to £300,000, and they say, "We will put on the city rates and estate and the inhabitants of Dublin proper three-fourths of that £100,000, leaving you in Rathmines and Pembroke

Dublin.
May 23, 1872.
Mr. Keigh.

only to pay your one-fourth, and we give you then as a benefit the advantage of the whole of our city estate." And they say further, "For water, as far as Pembroke is concerned, you are bound by agreement to pay us $\text{d} \frac{1}{2}$ more in arrears for ever 3d. in the pound; we propose to free you from that and place you on the same terms as in Dublin; it may be a little heavier at first but it will be greatly relieved, as we are paying off the water debt at the rate of £19,000 a year, and you will get the benefit of that hereafter." The figures, you know, may be all wrong, and Mr. Vernon said yesterday, "I cannot imagine it," speaking as to the value of the city estate. And others said, "They were under the impression there was no such estate." On the other hand, other persons told us if put into the market it would be worth from £500,000 or £700,000.

5151. Mr. White.—Now, sir, I thoroughly disbelieve that any financial advantages can accrue to my clients from any proposed amalgamation of the townships in respect to their liabilities and responsibilities. The streets of Dublin were almost admitted by every witness, except Alderman Harris, to be in a shocking state. Mr. Neville, their engineer, stated it would require at least £5,000 a year to keep these streets clean. Is it not the primary duty of a Corporation to sweep the streets?

5152. CHAIRMAN.—Certainly; and they say they are perfectly willing to do so, but that it is unfair that they should be doing extra sweeping on the streets from their being so largely used by the inhabitants of the townships.

5153. Mr. White.—It is suggested that financial advantages may accrue to the townships from the amalgamation. I say no, and why—because £5,000 per annum is required for a primary duty of the Corporation, and they have not got it to spend; therefore, I say am I not justified in arguing that this Corporation is in a state of insolvency when you tell its means for the objects they have to carry out. And this as the Corporation which says, "Now, let us amalgamate our debts, we that owe £500,000, and you that owe £100,000, and you shall have share in the city estate." What advantage is it to the inhabitants of Rathmines to be able to say of a morning when they get up, "Oh, we have been made joint owners with the Corporation in the city estate?" What they want is to have their roads better swept, better drained, better lighted, and to have an efficient body of police. They have got Commissioners which by their drainage scheme have shown themselves efficient, and the Corporation have done nothing except the introduction of the Vauxhall water, which, I admit, was a good work. The Commissioners of these townships have proved themselves immeasurably more efficient and of more use to their ratepayers than the Corporation to their ratepayers; and I say that the Corporation, if they have this good revenue, have their hands full and plenty to do in the city which they don't do; and it would be better for me and for you as ratepayers of the city than the Corporation attended to matters within their own reach, instead of propounding this scheme of a Utopian municipality. And it is really an abuse of time to produce witnesses to say we are bound in a ring fence, and have no building ground in Dublin, and if we amalgamate the townships we can get a place to shoot our rabbit. That is an argument that I have addressed to men who, I suppose, are rational. There has been a good deal of rubbish shot in the business already, and arguments of that sort show the weakness of the cause. There are one or two matters to which I would like to advert to before I sit down. One is what I already intimated is the sole argument that struck me as having any substance in favour of amalgamation and that was that because the inhabitants of the outer townships are the streets of the city of Dublin daily, therefore, they should pay a contribution towards their maintenance. At the first view that is certainly an argument that has some show of reason in it, but, on the other hand, may not the inhabitants and

the Commissioners of the townships say, "Our roads are used by the citizens of Dublin in going to the country and coming in from the country just as much as the streets of Dublin are used by persons residing in the township?" And, therefore, if there be a sort of an equitable right in the ratepayers of Dublin to call upon the suburban ratepayers to pay for the maintenance of the streets, it seems to me perfectly clear that the suburban townships have a corresponding right to make the citizens of Dublin pay for the use of their roads.

5154. CHAIRMAN.—That is, I understand, the Corporation scheme. They propose to take over their roads, and pay three-fourths of the cost.

5155. Mr. White.—May I ask, sir, how that proportion has been arrived at?

5156. CHAIRMAN.—It appears to be admitted, on all hands, that the valuation of Dublin ought to be increased, if there is a fair valuation to about £900,000, and that of Rathmines and Pembroke to about £300,000. If that be so, the Dublin people would pay about three-fourths of the cost of keeping up and scavenging the Rathmines and Pembroke roads, and the Rathmines people would pay one-fourth for the Dublin roads, as, I understand, this is their calculation and proposition.

5157. Mr. White.—Their proposition, practically, with respect to Rathmines is to subject them to £10,000 a year additional taxation. What do they propose to give them in exchange? not an improved drainage; that the people of Rathmines have already. They propose to incorporate them with the city of Dublin, and the only practical benefit is, that they permit them to use the streets; but if the inhabitants of Rathmines and Pembroke use the streets of Dublin, it is for the advantage of the shopkeepers. It would be a hard thing if the customer of a shopkeeper were made to pay for the keeping up of the roads to the shop where they laid out their money.

5158. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. O'Donnell produced a calculation as to the probable amount of future rates, as far as Pembroke is concerned. I called attention to the fact to-day, that, according to their balance-sheet, Pembroke was in debt on the current account £3,300. If I add that to the 3d. rate, Pembroke would then have had to pay, to be out of debt, about 3s. 8d. in the pound, and, say, 5d. for the main drainage, making 4s. 1d. in all. Mr. O'Donnell's calculation was about 4s. in the pound for the future rates of the city and townships if amalgamated. Suppose you add 1s. in the pound to the tax-dollars, which was not as much as he thought it would be, with regard to Rathmines and Pembroke, that would give £15,000 a year extra on a valuation of £300,000. Of that £15,000, the city proposes to pay three-fourths, and you one-fourth. I may be all wrong about this, but if there is any truth about the value of the city estate, I cannot help thinking that the townships are likely to be more frightened than hurt in the future.

5159. Mr. White.—I am afraid those figures are wrong.

5160. Mr. O'Donnell.—They are the auditor's figures.

5161. CHAIRMAN.—The city estates have paid on an average, for several years, over £19,000 a year; that is not income credited to and charged against the city in the accounts, and they have had to discharge themselves from that. That is a stubborn fact to start with.

5162. Mr. White.—You are sitting here not exactly as a Parliamentary Committee, with power to carry out these schemes, and force the townships in. The functions you and your brother Commissioner have to discharge is to make recommendations upon which you would suggest that Parliament should act in the future, and that being so, I do not think that you propose much upon what you have to do if you have laid before you a financial scheme on the part of the Corporation, which, in the first place, shows "if you do what we want you to do, the additional pounds rate on the township will not be as much as they

DEBATE.
May 21, 1878.
—
Mr. Knag.

think, and they need not be alarmed." I say that is not the question. The question is not purely a money question at all; it is a question of efficiency, and interfering with vested rights.

5163. CHAIRMAN.—By our extended warrant we must go into the question of taxation, the incidence of taxation, and the income and debts of the townships and city. I may tell you at once that if I thought the Dublin Corporation were insolvent I would not report for one single moment that these townships which are flourishing should be brought into an insolvent body. I would not listen to it, and the first thing I have to satisfy myself of is, that the Corporation is solvent, or at least, to take care and recommend that they should be protected against the effect of being brought into such a body; but, according to the evidence before us, we find that Dublin has a property worth, at least, £500,000, and that their debt is only £280,000 at present. These figures may also be taken as accurate from the auditor's accounts. Several English towns have debts immensely larger.

5164. Mr. White.—I am quite aware that Leeds and other cities owe much larger debts compared with their *ESTATES*. The fallacy lies in the use of the word "solvent." In one sense Dublin is solvent, in another it is insolvent. What is meant by solvency in the sense in which we are talking, means whether or not the Corporation of Dublin has funds available for carrying out its primary duties; I say in that sense it is insolvent.

5165. CHAIRMAN.—In that sense is not Rathmines utterly insolvent?

Mr. White.—I say not.

5166. CHAIRMAN.—Ask why, when there is nothing done there? If solvent, why have they not levied proper and sufficient rates, and done the necessary work? If they had struck a rate to do it this question would not arise about the difference of rating. There is one matter, that which has been alluded to. Everyone knows that labour and materials have increased within the last few years, that pressed on the Corporation very much, while the Rathmines people have not increased their taxation one single shilling to meet the exigencies of the time.

5167. Mr. White.—They are up to the maximum.

5168. CHAIRMAN.—They are not, because they can strike a sanitary rate to any amount they like.

5169. Mr. White.—Maybe they will do it.

5170. CHAIRMAN.—On whom will it fall? It will fall on the landlords there, the very persons who are to settle it. A person must be just to everybody, to the owners of the houses as well as occupiers in Rathmines. Did they ever call a meeting, for instance, in Rathmines to authorise them to go up to the 3s. 6d. rate? They cannot do the work properly on the rates they have struck. Mr. Vernon has told us that where there is a smaller population they employ thirty-eight men and seven or eight horses, and they have a sanitary staff besides. I can understand that you may be in a little difficulty, at least I feel I would, because if I was arguing for a railway company as connected with Pembroke I would find it a very different thing from arguing for them with reference to Rathmines.

5171. CHAIRMAN.—Until lately there was the most universal cry against the management by the Corporation of Dublin of the streets, &c., but when you say, "Here are two townships that are most admirably managed," I take leave to differ. I say one of the townships has been most admirably managed, but as far as the evidence goes it has satisfied me that there was next to nothing done in Rathmines so far as sanitary work was concerned. I don't recollect a town in which we sat, even the humbllest, on the former Commission, where something was not done with respect to carrying out the Sanitary Acts. I can understand the reason perfectly as to the omission at Rathmines; if I was an owner of property perhaps I would not like to tax myself.

5172. Mr. Heron.—I ask why should not the rail-

way company pay the full city taxation in respect of all their passengers arriving at their terminus?

Mr. White.—As I understand the question put to me by Mr. Heron it is suggested that I should explain why my company should not pay a sort of head-money upon all the passengers they deliver in the City of Dublin. That is a very difficult question, and it seems to me to apply to all railway companies who bring passengers, say, from Donegal and Kerry into Dublin, and if there be no better argument to advise I don't think I need dwell on it. But to come to the question of solvency, I commented by saying I did not believe that the Commissioners of Rathmines were infallible, or had not been guilty of shortcomings. The question is not, are they perfect, but are they more efficient than the Corporation of Dublin. Have you any assurance that you can make any advantageous proposition to Parliament by amalgamation with the Corporation of Dublin the administration of Rathmines would be improved? I say emphatically no.

5173. CHAIRMAN.—I asked you would your clients, as ratepayers in Rathmines, like to be attached to Pembroke, because there you would have efficient management?

Mr. White.—I am afraid that is not a practical suggestion.

5174. CHAIRMAN.—But that is a part of our inquiry. We might not recommend that any of these townships should be annexed to Dublin, but we might recommend that Rathmines should be attached to Pembroke. I asked Mr. Vernon yesterday whether they would be inclined to take them over, because then I could understand you saying, "I don't want to be attached to Rathmines at all, after the account we have heard of the management, but it would be for the advantage of our line to be attached to Pembroke."

5175. Mr. White.—Have the people of Rathmines in public meetings or public writing ever suggested that their state would be better by being annexed to Pembroke?

5176. CHAIRMAN.—If you ask me my opinion, I am sure they have not, and I am sure the owners of property would not wish it, because they would have to pay £s. 6d. or £s. 8d. in the pound more if attached to Pembroke.

5177. Mr. White.—I may say as far as my clients are concerned it would be a matter of most perfect indifference if you reported that Pembroke, being a better administered township than Rathmines, it would be advisable to annex Rathmines to Pembroke. But I say that we find from experience we would be in a very much worse position if attached to Dublin. May I say—this seems to me to lie at the root of the whole question. I apprehend in any recommendation which you think it your duty to make under your commission that you will have regard to what you consider to be practical and feasible; and may I ask has a single authority or precedent been cited in this year—I heard vague allusions to Manchester, which I believe is the model Corporation or municipality of the United Kingdom, and of certain townships being incorporated with it; I heard vague references to Darlington, Leeds, and Glasgow, where the reverse took place, and the townships resisted incorporation—but has any precedent been cited to you where Parliament has, in the case of townships whose existence has been recognised by several Acts of Parliament, as against the Corporation, annexed those townships to the Corporation, and taken away their rights as entities? And in my opinion it would be a very daring thing for Commissioners to recommend to Parliament that these townships should always refuse to unite with Dublin. I have asked for precedents the other way, and I have been told of one, the case of Hove and Brighton before Parliament in 1836. I am told that the town of Hove is physically just as much incorporated with Brighton as Rathmines with Dublin, there is not even a canal or a circular road to separate them, their systems of

SUSSES.
May 15, 1870
Mr. Keogh

drainage run into one another, and their systems of finance have become wound up in consequence of drainage charges. The Brighton Corporation introduced a Bill for the purpose of incorporating Hove, but it was resisted and rejected.

5178. Mr. CORROD.—Hove and Brighton are exactly analogous cases to Rathmines and Pembroke—the same class of towns. The Hove people don't go into Brighton every day in the same way that they go from Rathmines to Dublin.

5179. Mr. White.—There is probably that difference, they resort to each other, I apprehend. But if the inhabitants of the townships resort to the City of Dublin, the citizens of Dublin resort to the townships. Rathmines has become a regular street of shops, and we all know that the people of Dublin, whether on foot, or riding, or in carriage, go not through the streets of Dublin, but sit into the townships, and I am at a loss to know how any calculation that could lead to any satisfactory or definite result could ever have been made which would apportion the burthen between the Corporation and the townships, as to the degree in which the wear and tear of the streets have been contributed to by each.

5180. CHAIRMAN.—Therefore the Corporation say "we will get rid of all the difficulty by putting the rates into a common fund."

5181. Mr. White.—That is—"Because we cannot apportion £1,000, whether £80 on one and £21 on the other; we will amalgamate the whole thing and bring in the man that owes £1 and subject him to the liabilities of the man that owes £80."

5182. CHAIRMAN.—I don't understand it that way. "Let it be that your roads are largely used by Dublin, we take away all cause of complaint by saying we will pay three-fourths of that and only ask you to pay one-fourth," and to do the same with respect to Dublin.

5183. Mr. White.—We say—"we would rather pay our own expenses of keeping up our own roads, and let you keep up yours." It so happens that the township and the Corporation have recently been very much relieved from road expenditure by the construction of the tramways. But as far as I am instructed to represent the ratepayers of Rathmines, they say "we don't want to be incorporated with a city that has the highest death-rate and dirtiest streets in Europe, and which has done nothing for drainage, and cannot even sweep the streets." And this is the body which comes forward and says—"We are actuated by pure benevolence; we would like to improve these outer strangers, and bring them in, and give them schools, and magazies, and other advantages of civilisation." We don't agree with that, and hope you will make no suggestions which will have the effect of amalgamating Pembroke and Rathmines with Dublin.

5184. CHAIRMAN.—As I understand the facts with regard to Hove are these: In 1876 Brighton brought forward a Bill for incorporation. Hove said "it was only three years ago we were made a township, and you opposed us, but Parliament said we were strong enough to stand by ourselves," and the Committee refused to undo what had been done three years before.

5185. Mr. White.—I have been before a Parliamentary Committee about the Drainage Bill, and I know the Parliamentary Committee will not interfere with vested interests. There have been no public meetings, no expression of opinion of the ratepayers of Rathmines; on the contrary, they are almost unanimous against the incorporation, and it is almost unnecessary to remind you that in dealing with a question of this kind a Parliamentary Committee will have regard to the opinions of the ratepayers of a district, especially when the existence of the township has been recognised by Parliament. As I mentioned to you, the Pembroke and Rathmines Commissioners succeeded in forcing through Parliament, against the Corporation of Dublin, a separate scheme of drainage, although the Corporation pointed out that by passing a partial scheme Par-

liament would be lessening the chances in the future of a gigantic scheme of drainage. That shows that Parliament thought as in the case of Hove, that Rathmines and Pembroke were strong enough to stand by themselves.

5186. CHAIRMAN.—Would you suggest that in answer to the warrant we should say, "We decline to give any suggestion in regard to Dublin," or that its boundary should not be extended, because these townships are townships created under Acts of Parliament, and that we should do this where our inquiry is being held in pursuance of the recommendation of the Select Committee which sat for three years and came to the conclusion that "it is desirable to change the boundaries in several towns in Ireland." It appears from both the Reports submitted to the Committee that they were unanimous in thinking that a change of boundary very desirable in almost all the corporate towns in Ireland, and special attention was made to Dublin. That Committee knew perfectly well when they made their Report that the townships around Dublin were in existence, and evidence had been given before them that it would not be right on any terms to annex the townships to Dublin, partly on the grounds now suggested by you. [The Chairman read the passage in the Report, and Mr. Bent's suggested Report as to the proposed extension of boundary of Dublin, &c.]

5187. Mr. White.—But I apprehend there is nothing at all in the words you have read which make it affirmative on you to find that that is so, and that the townships should be amalgamated.

5188. CHAIRMAN.—Certainly not, but what I understand is that you confidently ask us to report against doing what a Parliamentary Committee suggests it might be desirable to have done on the grounds that the townships have been created by Acts of Parliament.

5189. Mr. White.—I appealed to your discretion as to how you would report. I can only say how the matter strikes me upon the evidence you have heard. If I were a Commissioner I would report that I had heard evidence pro and con, and that no sufficient evidence was brought before me to induce me to suggest to Parliament that any interference should be made in the vested interests of these townships.

5190. Mr. Heron.—May I ask if the railway company, or his clients, the directors for the shareholders, have any interest in the matter except the interests of those shareholders?

5191. Mr. White.—Better cross-examine Mr. Keogh.

5192. Mr. Heron.—I have heard a great deal of irrelevant matter, abuse of the Corporation, and I would like to have on your notes what is the valuation of the property in the city of Dublin.

5193. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Keogh, what is the quantity of land that was valued at £10,000, in Pembroke? I would also like to have the valuation of the railway company in Dublin, and in Rathmines for both buildings and land? The valuation of the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, in the city of Dublin, is as follows:—Acres extent of land not given by valuation office return, land, £3,656; buildings, £4,427. In Pembroke, extent 20 acres 1 rood and 19 perches; valuation of land, £10,092 13s.; buildings, £133 10s. Total, 10,216 5s.

5194. Mr. Heron.—They ought to have no interest except the financial interest of the shareholders.

5195. Is the valuation in Dublin over £15,000?

Mr. Keogh.—I did not expect at all to be examined to day or I would have brought all the papers.

5196. Mr. White.—The reason I asked that question about the proportion of five-sixths in Pembroke is this: If the railway company only paid on the quarter system it might be said they had a personal interest in keeping out of Dublin, but I think the fact that they only pay one-sixth less in Pembroke than they would pay in Dublin shows they have no money

BOSTON,
May 22, 1878.
Mr. Keigh-

interest in this question, but that they are making their suggestion not having any substantial money interest.

5197. Mr. Heron.—I think it will appear that they have a financial interest in being amalgamated; if your valuation in Dublin be a very high one you are directly financially interested in the new scheme.

Mr. James P. Lombard, Jr.

MR. JAMES FITZGERALD LOMBARD, JR., EXAMINED.

5198. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—You are Chairman of the Drumcondra Township Commissioners?—Yes.

5199. You have a considerable property under city taxation as well as under township taxation?—I have.

5201. You are largely interested in the firm of Arnott and Co.?—Yes.

5202. What is their rating?—It is very heavy, perhaps at a rough guess £1,500 a year, perhaps more. But my private interest in the city and county is very large, for I am chief owner, with Mr. McMahon, of close on seventy acres of building ground, one-half, as nearly as possible, is in the county, and one-half in the city, and therefore I have an opportunity of testing the relative merits of the two.

5203. You know the Drumcondra Township has only just been formed?—We got our bill last May, and are in existence seven or eight months.

5204. How many Commissioners have you?—Fourteen, I think.

5205. Have you proceeded since you became Commissioner to put the Public Health Act and others into operation?—We are putting all the powers we possess into effect as rapidly as possible.

5206. Since the township has been formed are you aware whether there has been any impetus given to improvements and buildings in the township?—A very great impetus. Some three years ago we found a considerable lift given to the township of Drumcondra by the establishment of tramways, and the impetus then given has been considerably increased by the conversion of that district into a township, and since the last year, on the land in which I am largely interested, there have been 100 houses built, some by ourselves, and others by parties who came and took the land for building much more freely than they would have done some years ago.

5207. What is the extent of land unbuilt on?—It is very considerable; I cannot tell you. It is very large; building has only started up there the last four or five years.

5208. What is the population of Drumcondra; it is stated to me to be 8,000?—About that.

5209. What is the total valuation of the township?—Over £12,000, and likely to increase very rapidly.

5210. What is the area?—About 864 acres.

5211. What, in your opinion, would be the result of annexing your township, now in its infancy, to the Corporation?—I am quite satisfied that progress would stop, that is, of course, people would crawl on a little, but the present very active pace at which Drumcondra is improving would change and fall away.

5212. I believe there are 5½ miles of roads in your township?—Yes.

5213. Those roads include Glasnevin-road and the roads to the Botanic Garden. In your opinion, are those roads used more largely by the citizens of Dublin than the township?—There is an immense traffic. I happen to be acquainted with Glasnevin district for a number of years, in connexion with the cemeteries, and I know there is an enormous traffic of hay and produce over the roads leading into the city.

5214. In your opinion, has the city been well managed by the Corporation?—That is a very large

5198. CHAIRMAN.—And it makes no difference, as far as sanitary matters are concerned, whether you remain as you are or not?

Mr. Keigh.—We have given our opinion as representing one-eighth of the township, and we prefer remaining as we are.

question. I am very anxious to say in common justice that I have no feeling against the Corporation.

5215. Except that you do not want them to govern you?—Exactly. I was a member of the Corporation for some time, eight or nine years ago, and I know that some members of the Corporation give a large amount of valuable time to the business. I believe the best men in the Corporation are never heard of in public, they work in the committee.

5216. Is the feeling in the township against annexation?—The strong majority is against annexation. There were two or three votes when the question was fairly brought before the Commissioners, and the large majority, more than two to one, were against it.

5217. Was any one in the minority a Town Councillor?—Yes; one of the three.

Cross-examined by Dr. Norwood.

5218. Have you struck any rates under your Act?—Yes.

5219. To what amount?—2d. for general rate and 1d. for water, 6d. being the contract price, and 3d. for little extras that were likely to occur. The Corporation have met us in a very fair spirit with regard to the water ; we have an agreement all but concluded, and we are satisfied with it.

5220. Are these the only rates you have struck?—Yes.

5221. As far as your experience goes, do the members of the Corporation discharge their duties fairly and satisfactorily?—I and so. I have a great respect for many members of the Corporation who do their work admirably; I don't mean as friends, some of them I know, and some I do not, but I know that the Corporation is often abused very unjustly, that is my opinion, though I am not disposed to unite with them.

5222. You have built largely in the city?—We have thirty-five or thirty-six acres in the city, and about the same in the county; but I think I should like to say we build better houses in the county than in the city. It would not pay us well to build good houses in the city as in the country.

5223. CHAIRMAN.—Do you find that the better class of people like to go into the county?—Yes.

5224. I see that you got your Act last May, and the Report of the House of Commons in June recommends that under no circumstances should one township be allowed to grow up within two miles of another.—We got our bill at the end of May.

5225. Does any part of the railway go through you?—The Midland and the Great Southern and Western Railway.

5226. How did you manage to make them pay the full rate, you must have got a very favourable committee?—I don't know.

5227. Dr. Norwood.—Three shillings is your maximum.

5228. Mr. Walker.—Except for sanitary purposes.

5229. CHAIRMAN.—Some one said the railway companies were not appearing in the case of Drumcondra. It makes no difference to them whether they are attached to Dublin or not, as they are paying the full rate,

Mr. MICHAEL PETTIT examined.

5230. Mr. Walker, q.c.—You are the secretary of this township?—Yes.

5231. When did you strike this rate?—On the 5th of May.

5232. What is the amount of it?—2s. 8d.

5233. Can you give us the valuation of the township?—£12,717, and the population something over 3,000.

5234. Give the total area?—Eight hundred and seventy acres.

5235. What proportion of that is built-on land?—More than two-thirds, mostly pasture land.

5236. Since the township has been formed has there been a considerable impetus in building?—I think there has.

5237. Are you aware of the feeling of the ratepayers on the question of annexation?—We tested that matter by sending out circulars. We sent out 400.

5238. Is the feeling against it?—Strongly against.

5239. Mr. Heron.—You sent out 400?—Yes, and got back 226.

5240. Mr. Walker.—Were there any in favour of annexation?—Twenty-five.

5241. Mr. Heron.—How many ratepayers are there?—610 separate ratings, and about 500 ratepayers.

5242. Then there are 100 you did not send any to?—They were occupiers of small houses, cottages, and the like.

5243. Mr. Cotton.—How many ratepayers are qualified to sit as Commissioners?—I have not calculated that; the qualification is not very high.

5244. Mr. Walker.—The qualification is a £5 rating, is it not?—Any ratepayer living in the township and occupying or owning property of £35 value in which he has an interest of at least five years to run.

5245. Mr. Heron.—The bay of the ground is towards the south, it is a place likely to be built on largely?—Yes.

5246. Mr. Walker.—If left as a township?—Yes.

5247. CHAIRMAN.—Have you a sanitary staff?—We have an executive sanitary officer who is the secretary, and a sub-sanitary officer.

5248. Have you a consulting sanitary officer?—Dr. Neddy. We are an urban sanitary authority.

5249. Have you got a surveyor?—Yes.

5250. Have you fixed his salary?—Yes, £50 a year for the present.

5251. Does he give you all his time?—No.

5252. What is his salary?—£50.

5253. How much of the roads of your township do the distillery carts go over?—Their traffic mostly lies over Ballybough-brdge.

5254. CHAIRMAN.—Can you give me any estimate of the amount of coal and grain carried to that large distillery over the Dublin streets, and of the produce thereof?—I have not the least idea.

5255. It must be enormous!—No doubt.

5256. Is there not a mill belonging to Mr. Todd there?—Yes.

5257. Don't they cart enormous quantity of corn up every year, also coal and flour from the mill?—No doubt.

5258. Is there not some other mill?—There is a paper mill belonging to Mr. Walker.

5259. That is driven by steam machinery, and Todd's mill also?—Yes.

5260. Can you form any idea as to the number of thousands of tons of coal, materials, and produce, that goes to and from these establishments every year, and which is carted through the streets of Dublin?—I can give no idea.

5261. Do you think it fair that the parties owning those should increase the wear and tear, and scavenging of the streets of Dublin by this traffic, and not pay a farthing for it?—I think they have a reciprocal benefit.

5262. What is the benefit?—It gives employment to a large number of men.

5263. Have you a large artisan population there, or do they live in the city?—We have a large number of houses fit for artisans. We have 634 houses, and of those 182 are under £5 valuation.

5264. Do the artisans employed in the paper and flour mills, or the distillery, live in your township or the city?—I cannot tell you, our township is young.

5265. Mr. Cotton.—Is there no sanitary rate?—No.

5266. CHAIRMAN.—How do you intend to get on?—Pay it out of the general rate.

5267. I think you will find that the sanitary will require you to keep the sanitary separate?—I know it to be the case in other townships, carrying on very large sanitary business and having no sanitary rate.

5268. Mr. Heron, q.c.—In Drumcondra are there not a large number of public institutions?—There are.

5269. Aren't there colleges, convents, and two very large lunatic asylums in the district?—I think there is only one lunatic asylum—Lynch's is beyond us. The only one is Richmond.

5270. Are there not large public laundries in the township?—No, Hyde Park is outside.

5271. Beyond your township?—Yes.

DUBLIN,
May 22, 1879
Mr. M. Pettit

STEPHEN EUGENE McCARTHY examined.

Stephen E.
McCarthy

5272. Mr. Walker, q.c.—You are Land Agent for Captain Lynch?—Yes.

5273. He has a large property within the township?—Yes.

5274. Are you one of the Commissioners?—I am.

5275. Since this township has been formed has there been any improvement in it?—Very considerable, indeed.

5276. What is your opinion on the question of the annexation of the township?—I think it would be disastrous to the best interests of the ratepayers.

5277. You know this township very well—what proportion is arable land, and what is pasture land?—I consider about three-fourths is arable and pasture land.

5278. You are not within the metropolitan district?—That portion of Captain Lynch's property within the township is in great part within the metropolitan district.

5279. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think it desirable to have one portion of the township under the metropolitan police and the other portion under the Royal Irish

Constabulary?—We don't object to that, but we object very seriously to being incorporated with Dublin.

5280. Why?—For various reasons.

5281. We had better have the resources?—I have looked at it in all aspects, and I don't think it would be in any shape or form desirable.

5282. Do you apprehend increased taxation?—Yes.

5283. Are your reasons on account of increased taxation?—Yes, and want of confidence in the management of the Corporation. I am of opinion—all I can give is my own opinion—that that the Corporation should show they are able to manage their own business before they propose to manage ours.

5284. They could not tell you anything about your management, for they have not had time yet?—They should give us credit for good intentions.

5285. In considering the question of taxation are you of opinion the Corporation is insolvent?—I should not like to say anything of the Corporation of Dublin. I don't like to—they are most respectable gentlemen. Many of them I know well.

DUBLIN,
May 25, 1884.
Stephen E.
McCarthy.

5286. You say you have no confidence in the Corporation at all, and one of the first questions is are they solvent or insolvent—I don't mean the members of the Corporation, but the Corporation itself?—If I am to depend on Parliamentary returns, I see it was mentioned by Mr. Vernon, that they had spent £30,000 more than their means, and I would not have confidence in a body that does that.

5287. Do you believe they have an estate worth £20,000 a year?—I heard from you that the valuation is £400,000, and the debt £300,000.

5288. And that is a few years it will increase by £17,000?—If so what do they want to answer us for?

5289. Mr. Vernon said he was astonished to hear it!—And as am I.

5290. You may take this for granted, that Mr. Finlay, the auditor, has charged something less than £20,000 as received by the Corporation from their corporate property?—All I can say is, that if they are so solvent they should keep Dublin in a better state than they do.

5291. Last year they were charged with a net sum of £17,433, the year before £17,397, and in 1875, £18,350—it varies a little every year!

5292. Mr. Walker, q.c.—I take it the chairman is right; that the Corporation have had that £18,000 for a long time; but do you think they make good use of it?—I don't think they do. I wish we had it.

5293. Mr. Heron, q.c.—Would you like to be annexed to Dublin?—I would not have anything to do with them.

5294. CHAIRMAN.—Is arable land made to pay the full rate up to 2s 4d?—Yes; up to 2s 4d.

5295. Do you think that arable land should pay the same as house property?—I think arable land should not pay the maximum rate.

5296. Does it not pay it now?—No. After it reaches 2s. 4d. they are to pay one-half. We failed in getting the other before the House of Commons Committee.

EDWARD McMAHON EXAMINED.

E. McMahon.

5297. Mr. Walker, q.c.—You are one of the Commissioners of Drumcondra?—Yes.

5298. Have you property in the township?—Yes.

5299. Is it building ground?—Yes.

5300. Has there been any building on it by you since the township was formed?—Yes, in connection with Mr. Lombard.

5301. Has the formation of the township given an impetus to improvement in the district?—Very great.

5302. If you had not become a separate township do you think that improvement would have existed?—The township increased it very much.

5303. What is your opinion about being tied to the Corporation?—It would be a very bad marriage for both parties, and I will tell you the reason. The improvement rate of Dublin is £60,000 a year, or 2s in the pound on the valuation of £300,000. There are 100 miles of streets in the city, and therefore it takes £600, in or about, to maintain a mile of streets in Dublin. The Corporation of Dublin propose to take in the townships and portions of the county with a valuation of £200,000, on which the improvement rate would amount to £30,000 a year, and they would have to maintain out of that £30,000—40 miles of roads. I am at a loss to understand how they could maintain 40 miles of roads with an income of £300 a mile, when they can't do the streets of Dublin with double the amount; and therefore, if it cost the same in the townships as in the city to maintain the roads, there would be a deficiency of £16,000 a year.

5304. CHAIRMAN.—Where did you find out it costs £600 per mile?—From themselves.

5305. Mr. Corcoran.—Do you know it has been given in evidence that the roads in Rathmines are maintained for £150 per mile?—Yes.

5306. What do your roads in Drumcondra cost?—The engineer will be better able to say. I find £13,000 is put down for the scavenging and water in the city in one year.

5307. £400 a mile for roads in Drumcondra would be absurd!—But if the Corporation get it into their hands we know what will occur. Mr. Neville acknowledges the receipts from the improvement rate are over £60,000 a year. The receipts, after making a great deal of allowance and all that, for lighting, scavenging, and maintaining the roads, are £53,600.

5308. Mr. Heron, q.c.—How long have you and Mr. Lombard been engaged in building within the city?—For about twelve years.

5309. About how much have you spent within the

city in that time?—About 600 houses, large and small.

5310. That is all up about Bellingham-street, Eccles-street, and going north?—Yes; and to the south side also, towards Keppel's Nursery, we have built a good many, and we have opened up about thirty streets in the city.

5311. Did you make all these roads yourselves?—Yes, and covered them, too.

5312. And had them cut in streets?—Yes.

5313. In fact you have made a regular town?—It would be a big town if it was altogether.

5314. Are these houses now all inhabited?—Yes; there is a great demand for that class of house.

5315. Has the work been a great financial success?—It has.

5316. In the new township of Drumcondra, how much have you built?—About 100 houses are built on our ground within a couple of years.

5317. Are these 100 houses in the township close to the 600 you have built in the thirty new streets in the city?—Oh, no.

5318. How far are they away?—Well, some of them are only ten minutes walk away. The township begins about a mile off—less than a mile.

5319. That is tolerably close. Do some of the houses in Drumcondra begin half a mile from these streets?—They do.

5320. Where did you stop building within the city?—We have a good deal of ground to let still.

5321. You are just going on quietly?—Yes.

5322. And building according to the demand for houses?—Yes.

5323. Can you say about how many people live in these 600 houses?—Well, no; but I suppose between 3,000 and 4,000.

5324. Do these people pay heavy taxes in the city?—They do; both taxes and rents. I consider that new houses, and particularly small houses, are very heavily taxed. For instance, a house lot at £25, taxes included, is valued at £18. There is 6d taxes on that house.

5325. Are these houses valued for taxation at a much higher rate relatively than the houses in South Great George's-street, for instance?—I believe so; and it is one of the things I mean to suggest. I understand that in Belfast there is a sliding scale of valuation for small houses—that is, working-men's houses—and that such houses would be valued at one-third; whereas, if it was a better class house, it would be valued at two-thirds of its letting value. The high valuation is a great deterrent on the erection of poor-class houses.

here. Mr. Lenhard and myself had often in contemplation the building of a number of houses which would let at 4*s*. a week, for the artisan classes ; but we found, on examination, it would not pay for a high valuation, as a low class house taken away a great deal of the profit. We found that a house let at £15 a year would be taxed at £3 a year—that is, for having Ventury water, and so on. The same applies in America ; they exempt from high valuation the small houses ; and in Belfast, where, I believe, that principle is applied, it encourages the building of an immense number of small houses. They say that on the £15 house, the rates there would be only £1 or 3*s*, and that being so, we could afford to let the house at 3*s*.

5326. CHAIRMAN.—I see, whether right or wrong about it, Mr. Neville makes out that it is a total fallacy to say that it costs £500 a mile to keep the streets of Dublin ; and, on the contrary, he makes it out at only £300 a mile, and he points out the remarkable difference between Dublin and the English towns. He says you have no right to take English towns into comparison with Dublin, inasmuch as hundreds of thousands of pounds have been spent there on paving. The Corporation of Dublin have not yet got the pavement, but he says the average cost in England bears no proportion to the cost in Dublin, having regard to the enormous amount of money borrowed there for paving purposes.

5327. Mr. Neville.—Manchester, for instance, is an entirely paved city.

5328. Mr. McMahon.—Isn't the valuation of the City of Dublin £600,000? Doesn't the improvement rate amount to £50,000, and how does that go?

5329. CHAIRMAN.—There is so much of it expended on lighting!—Yes; I admit it is applicable to the lighting and cleansing of the roads.

5330. Do you not think that the large establishments in Drumcondra must absorb some portion of that for keeping the streets clean, while they do not pay any rates to the city?—I know all that, but I deny any one to deny that it costs £60,000 a year for the city roads. No one will go outside of that. I wish to explain to the Commissioners. I heard you

make an observation about the right of the townships to pay for the poor living in the city, or something to that effect.

5331. No, I did not say their right to pay for the poor in the city, but it is alleged, on the part of the Corporation, that a great deal of work is cast upon them in consequence of a large portion of the artisan and labouring class living in the city, and not in the townships. That the townships are thus lightened from an amount of pauperism, that they don't pay their fair amount of rates-at-large charges for Justice of the Peace, and so on!—But in the poor law they do pay for it. I read the report of a speech by Mr. Byrne, that the poor rates were more in the city than in Drumcondra ; the figures were—Drumcondra, £4, the city £2 2*s*; but while that was so, Drumcondra had only seven paupers in the North Dublin Union, so that it cost £1,500 a year for the seven. The balance of the £1,500 goes to pay for union rating, for the maintenance of paupers in the North Dublin Union—a large proportion of whom belong to the city.

5332. I don't see how you have to pay 2*s*!
Here it is. It is in consequence of the large proportion that we have to pay for the paupers in the city. A man must have four years unbroken residence before he is chargeable to any particular division. If during the last four years he went out of the city, he must be charged to union rating, although for the last twenty years he may have lived in the city, and therefore numbers of people living in the North City Electoral Division for numbers of years, are now chargeable to union rating, and Drumcondra has to pay its proportion of that. As a matter of fact, the maintenance of paupers in the Drumcondra district has been 8*d*. for a number of years.

5333. Mr. Walker, Q.C.—So that you contribute largely to the relief of the poor!—Yes. I heard it stated here also that the Corporation subscribe £4,000 or £5,000 a year to the hospitals of the city, but that is only an item as compared with the expenses of any of the hospitals, and, of course, the people in Drumcondra and the other townships contribute to that as well as anybody else.

Mr. JOHN BYRNE, Collector-General, examined.

Mr. J. Byrne.

5334. I don't intend to offer any evidence on the main question, but there is a collateral matter which I think it my duty to bring before you, and it is for you to say whether it should appear in your minutes or not. I have put it in the shape of a letter. [Reads letter.]

“Dear Sir,—In the event of the amalgamation of the townships with the city of Dublin, it would be absolutely necessary to make provision for the collection of the rates in the united district. At present all the townships are, in this respect, more advantageously circumstanced than the city, as also are the poor law boards for the county portion of their rates, as, for instance, in the townships of Rathmines and Pembroke, there is not any exemption from the local rates for vacant premises, and in the entire county of Dublin, as in all Ireland, except the city of Dublin, premises occupied at the time of making the poor rate, are liable for the entire rate, notwithstanding a subsequent vacancy. The houses and farms, moreover, of reckoning the rates in the city are far more difficult and complicated than elsewhere, and the facilities for making the payment are thereby so great, that fully 7*s* per cent. of the assessment is lost through this cause alone, and a high poundage rate in the city is unavoidable so long as these difficulties are allowed to stand in the way.—Faithfully yours, John Byrne, Collector-General.”

5335. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing my friend and I were to recommend that subject to certain conditions Rathmines and the other townships should be brought in, is there any suggestion you wish to give as regards the collection or striking of rates in the united district?—If Rathmines and the other townships were brought in without any arrangement being made as to the collection of rates, those townships would be considerably damaged in consequence, because the poundage

rates would not then realize anything like what they at present realize unless some alteration was made.

5336. What you refer to, and what Mr. Stokes referred to in his evidence, is the difference in the collection in Rathmines as compared with Dublin. In Finsbarke they say there was only £97 uncollected last year!—Yes, and of the poor rates in Rathmines, in 1877-78 there was not £100 turned out of £7,000 or £8,000, and no portion is unrecovorable.

5337. Could you give us any suggestion with regard to the striking of the rate, or any alteration in the collection of it that would make it fair to the townships?—I suggest in this letter indirectly that the arrangements which are at present in operation in relation to the assessment, liability, and collection of the Finsbarke and Rathmines rates, should be extended to the united district. That is indirectly intimated there, but I don't wish to give evidence on the main point.

5338. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—How would that operate with regard to unoccupied houses?—If a house is occupied when the poor rate is made, everywhere but in Dublin, it is liable for that rate; if it is unoccupied it is liable for the proportion of the rate for which it shall subsequently become occupied.

5339. CHAIRMAN.—In Dublin does it get off altogether?—No, but the difficulties are so great in Dublin, in consequence of the complication in reference to the service of notices, that a large proportion of the city rates are lost, and therefore a poundage rate for any purpose will not do as much in Dublin for the local body as it will for the townships.

5340. The last gentleman said he put down 7*s* per

DUBLIN.
May 23, 1878.
E. McMahon.

DUBLIN
May 22, 1879.
from
Mrs J. BYRNE.

out for uncollected rates in the city!—It is 12½ per cent., I think. There will always be some remission for vacancies and uncollected rates, but my calculation is that 12½ per cent. is lost owing to the difference in the incidence of the rates in Dublin and the townships.

5341. If a house was idle at the time of assessment, and was let three weeks afterwards, how do you find out the amount of the assessment it should bear?—I always include every house, whether let or not.

5342. Suppose it is unlet!—Then the owner must discharge himself by a declaration satisfactory to me. May I take it you will put that letter on your minutes?

5343. Certainly. Suppose there is any portion of the county of Dublin and of the townships recommended by us to be annexed to the city, could the collection

be made by your office at the same poundage rate, or whatever it is that costs the city at present?—It is 2½ per cent. at present.

5344. And would 2½ per cent. enable you to collect the rates in the united district?—I think so, because the police rate and the bridges rate are at present collected by me at 2½ per cent. in the townships and county, but it would involve an increase of my staff, and I presume an increase of my salary.

5345. We won't object to that, but still, do you think it could be done for 2½ per cent.?—I think I could do it.

5346. If it caused an increase you could hardly with fairness put that on the townships because they were annexed to the city!—I could do it at 2½ per cent.; at all events I could do it in the townships at 3 per cent.

Mr. JOHN E. V. VERNON, M.A., Chairman Clontarf Township Commissioners.

5347. I appear, but not formally or officially, here because I understand the Corporation don't desire to amalgamate us. They have not invited us to join them.

5348. CHAIRMAN.—No; the way it stands is this:—The Corporation don't want to bring you in, but we were handed a memorandum from a certain number of ratepayers stating (see Appendix, No. 29) they wished to be brought in!—I am aware of that.

5349. No matter whether the Corporation desire it or not, we have to inquire whether we think it right to bring Clontarf in or not. Mr. Killen was instructed to appear for certain ratepayers, and then we got a statement sent in by your secretary that the Commissioners did not want to be brought in, and that they would reserve their case until we went there, but we will hear them here whether they wish to be brought in or not. We sent them a copy of the memorial from these parties in Clontarf!—As we have not been invited to join in the scheme we did not think it necessary to come here and occupy your attention with evidence, but at the same time we are ready to give evidence if you wish it. We have not our secretary here to-day, because we were not aware he might be wanted, but I shall give you any information in my power.

5350. If you have no objection to hear what is stated on the part of these memorandums, then tomorrow you can come here, either your secretary or yourself. I see Mr. Baker here to-day. Do the Grand Jury intend to take part in the inquiry or to give us their opinion?

5351. Mr. Baker.—Yes. I came here for the purpose of ascertaining how soon the townships would close, and when they have concluded I will appear on behalf of the Grand Jury.

5352. CHAIRMAN.—I think the townships will close to-day.

5353. Dr. MORSEED.—There is Kilmainham still to be heard.

5354. CHAIRMAN.—Clontarf will finish to-day. Kilmainham is to go on to-morrow, and then we will be glad to hear Mr. Baker. When Mr. Vernon has heard what is stated by these ratepayers in Clontarf he could give his evidence.

5355. Mr. Baker.—Would it be equally convenient to the Commissioners to appear an early day next week?

5356. CHAIRMAN.—No, I cannot sit after to-morrow, and therefore we want to finish, if possible, by to-morrow. I suppose you know the proposal here, Mr. Baker?

Mr. Baker.—Yes.

5357. CHAIRMAN.—The portions on the map that are coloured yellow are the portions of the county which are proposed to be brought into the city.

5358. Mr. Baker.—Yes, you were good enough to send us an intimation of what they proposed.

5359. Mr. Killen.—With regard to the Clontarf Commissioners they are fully apprised of our intention to make this application.

5360. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, we apprised them also.

5361. Mr. Killen.—Our secretary sent a copy of the

memorial to the Commissioners, including Mr. Vernon, so there can be no ambiguity about our intentions.

5362. Mr. Vernon.—The Commissioners are unanimously opposed to the scheme, and if you bring forward certain evidence they would like to rebut it.

5363. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose you will be able to give us the trade or business carried on by the inhabitants?

5364. Mr. Killen.—Certainly. I appear here on behalf of certain ratepayers of Clontarf who desire to have that township annexed to the city of Dublin. Before I go into the question of the propriety of making such a change I would like to make one or two observations as to what has occurred within the last few days. In the first place there has been an effort to create an impression on the general mind—I don't refer to your particular judgment, which I know is above being prejudiced by such instigations—that this petition or memorandum has been gotten up by certain publicans in Clontarf merely with the view of enabling them to open their public-houses on Sundays. I entirely and indignantly repudiate such an imputation. There is no ground at all for it. It would be an extraordinary thing if the publicans of Clontarf did not append their names to the memorial, but as to its being a mere petition from publicans, you will see from the names that are appended to it that such a statement is entirely false and unfounded. There is a further matter to which I wish to allude. At the last sitting of the Commission a gentleman appeared here, and when I presented myself he questioned my right to appear as representative of certain ratepayers of Clontarf. That gentleman has been in attendance every day since, but from the statement made yesterday morning by Mr. Charles Flanagan it appears he had no right to question my appearance, or to appear himself before the Commissioners of Clontarf, for it seems that whatever their claims may be, whatever the power of their opposition may be, they have got in no formal appearance. Therefore, we put our case before you plainly, implicitly, and without varnish, and we entirely leave it to your consideration whether, on the evidence we will produce, and the argument we will advance, the townships of Clontarf should get the advantages of the city.

Now, in considering the question of annexation of Clontarf it seems to me an extraordinary thing that the advocates of amalgamation have never thought of taking Clontarf in, if only for the purpose of a symmetrical rectification of the boundaries of the city. Clontarf is a very historic and very old portion of the suburbs, associated with many recollections of former times. It is very near the city, it is in fact almost joined to it, and it is very largely resorted to by the citizens of Dublin for the purposes of pleasure and health. I shall show by evidence which, I think, will be satisfactory, that the annexation of Clontarf will be not only beneficial to Clontarf, but also to the city. We do not join with those who cry down the Corporation of Dublin. We have sufficient confidence in them to desire to be brought under their management.

5365. CHAIRMAN.—Was Clontarf a portion of the old

county that was called the county of the city of Dublin!

Mr. Killen.—I am informed it was.

5346. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—Here is the ancient map showing the boundaries. [Produces map.]

5347. Mr. Cotton.—It just takes in the foreshore.

Chairman.—And then went up to the mill at Raby.

5348. Mr. Heron, Q.C.—And then the yellow line crossed the bay and struck at Blackrock.

5349. Mr. Killen.—We do not, I say, join in the very strong condemnation which has overwhelmed the Corporation of Dublin from some of the townships—Pembroke and others, especially Rathmines, in fact we have so high an opinion of the Corporation that we wish to be under their control. Of course we have a high opinion of our own Commissioners, but at the same time we have a higher opinion of the governing power of the Corporation of Dublin. Any reasons which have been assigned for the annexation of any other townships can be assigned with double force as regards Clontarf. Anything said about the want of sanitary arrangements in Rathmines and other districts can be repeated with double emphasis as regards Clontarf. Of course it might be regarded by some as a very humiliating thing to have any township resign its independence, but I know we found it a very needless ceremony. In the first instance, we have not the advantages of the Metropolitan Police. I don't want to attack one iota of credit to the Royal Irish Constabulary; they are an excellent body, as every one knows, but they are more a military body than a social protective force. Moreover, their number is not sufficient for the protection of life and property in Clontarf. People there have found they are quite unable to carry out arrangements for the proper protection of life and property, and we shall show this by evidence, and that is the main thing to be depended on. In the open day robberies have been committed; at night there are no patrols along the dark places—we cannot call them streets; and if a gentleman is obliged to leave his house at night for any purpose, say for the purpose of procuring a doctor, any anxiety may be committed on the members of his household.

5350. Mr. Cotton.—Do you assume that if the boundary of Dublin was altered so as to include Clontarf, the boundary of the Metropolitan Police District would be altered also?

Mr. Killen.—I assume so. We have nothing at all to do with that boundary, but, I presume, as a matter of fact, it would be so, and then if the city boundary was extended, the police boundary would follow it.

5351. Mr. Cotton.—The two don't depend on each other at all, now, remember.

5352. Mr. Killen.—No, but I presume that the outlying parts which are brought into the city would get all the city privileges.

5353. Dr. Norwood.—The Lord Lieutenant can, at any time, alter the boundary of the Metropolitan Police District, so that if the city boundary was extended to a two-mile circle, the Lord Lieutenant, by an Order in Council, could extend the police district also.

5354. Mr. Cotton.—I am aware he could, but would he?

Dr. Norwood.—I am sure he would, if it was found necessary to do so.

5355. Mr. Cotton.—Then if the power exists, why is the district left as at present. It doesn't follow, as a matter of course by any means, that because the city boundary is extended the police district would be extended, too.

Dr. Norwood.—I have endeavoured to ascertain how it was the entire bulk of the Metropolitan Police was thrown to the south of the city, and I have failed to find any reason.

5356. Mr. Killen.—Looking at the map you find the metropolitan area extending 10 miles south of Dublin, and on the north, towards Clontarf, it ends abruptly at the city boundary. I don't for a moment intend to blame the Commissioners of Clontarf; they have done their duty, no doubt, as far as is in their power; but

then it was not in their power. A very important question is the lighting of the township at night, and any person standing on Amstelley-bridge at night, looking along towards the railway bridge into the utter darkness, would be afraid to trust himself to the tender motives of anyone he might chance to meet. Besides the Egyptian darkness, there are no policemen to be found; they are supposed, theoretically, to be there, but they are not to be found. Often they are found in the neighbourhood of a few public-houses in Fairview, but along the roads they are not to be found. I shall show that a gentleman coming home at an early hour by Amstelley-bridge was assailed by questionable characters, and had to fly for the protection of his life and property, no police at all to be found. With regard to the state of the roads—a very important question—the people of Dublin use Clontarf very largely, on Sundays and holidays especially; in fact, the whole district is a very favourite resort for the citizens, and what is the condition of the roads? I may describe them, in dry weather, as a whirlwind of dust, and in wet weather as a mass of mud. Clontarf is a seashore along which the people of Dublin walk, and if the roads are not kept in proper order it is exceedingly inconvenient and unpleasant for the people who come out from the city for the purpose of enjoying a holiday at the seaside. Now, why are the roads not repaired; why are the footpaths not kept in order? As I said before I don't attach blame to the Commissioners. I think they have not got the means of making proper footpaths, or for keeping the roads in repair. They can only levy a certain amount of rate, and that amount is not sufficient. There is another important point in connection with the matter of the roads, namely, as to crossings which are essential, and I am informed that there are no crossings between Amstelley-bridge and Dollymount, except one, and that is leading up to the secretary's house in Marino Crescent. I believe there is one farther down towards the Catholic chapel, a so-called crossing, but it is not a stone crossing, but a sort of sandbank rising of very bad sand, which in wet weather becomes worse than the ordinary road. That crossing is cleansed once in every three or four weeks, if so often.

5357. Mr. Cotton.—Do you mean crossings on the coast road, or on the inland roads?

Mr. Killen.—There are no crossings on the inland roads at all. There is one crossing on the coast road on the left-hand side leading up to the secretary's house. There is another towards the Catholic chapel, but not a stone crossing, singly a raised portion of the ordinary road. Further on towards Dollymount there are no crossings whatever. The road in wet weather is almost impassable all along, and anyone who wishes to preserve the ordinary amount of cleanliness on his boots, we will not speak of ladies, for the roads could not be crossed at all by them, but anyone wishing to preserve any cleanliness cannot use the roads. There are no kerb stones whatever on the footpaths along the coast road; not one; and in the whole township there has been no attempt to introduce the improvement of asphalt. I believe, in the interior where some of the Commissioners live, and some of the gentry and higher classes are to be found, very considerable improvements are made on the roads, and there is a certain amount of decency preserved there; but along the shore, which is the part most used by the people of Dublin, the condition of Clontarf is utterly abominable and disgraceful. There is another point of importance which concerns not only Clontarf but Dublin also—there is no system of sewage whatever in Clontarf. There are some houses which have connexions with large drains which were built before the Commissioners had anything whatever to do with the place, and before it came into existence as a township. There is no system of sewage such as in Dublin, and it would be impossible for any resident in Clontarf, in case he wanted to make a sewer for himself, to do so, for he would not be allowed.

DUNLEATH.
May 21, 1870.
Mr. Killen.

DUBLIN.
May 22, 1872.
Mr. Killen.

5378. Mr. Corcoran.—Are the Commissioners the sanitary authority?

Mr. Killen.—I think they are.

5379. Mr. Corcoran.—Then they have care of the sewage of the district?

Mr. Killen.—Certainly; but I can show you they have given themselves no trouble to inquire where nuisances exist, or to remove them.

5380. Mr. Corcoran.—What is the population of Clontarf?

Mr. Killen.—It is between 3,000 and 4,000.

5381. Mr. Corcoran.—Then how did they become an urban sanitary authority?

Mr. Killen.—I can't answer that.

5382. Mr. Corcoran.—Is it the Commissioners or the guardians who do the sanitary work of the township?

Mr. Killen.—The Commissioners have the sanitary authority. Mr. Balcombe, secretary to the Commissioners, is the sanitary officer; Mr. Needham is the sub-sanitary officer, and there is a coexisting sanitary officer. In considering the question of the health of Clontarf, it must be remembered that anything affecting Clontarf affects Dublin also.

5383. CHAIRMAN.—Being Town Commissioners under their special Act they became, under the Act of 1871, the sanitary authority for their district, before that they were not the sanitary authority. It was then vested in the Board of Guardians.

Mr. Killen.—I was calling your attention to what I think is pretty clear that any ill health in Clontarf must affect the people of Dublin also, for the majority of the people of Clontarf do business in Dublin; they derive their wealth from the city. A great number of the citizens are in the habit of coming to Clontarf continually, and more especially in the summer season, so that it will be seen that any state of things which is injurious to the health of the people of Clontarf must be felt in the city also. In Clontarf township there is no hospital in case of infectious disease, so that if any person contracts infectious disease within the township he must remain there and foster in his isolated abode; there is no relief whatever. I just wish to refer you to one matter with regard to the Metropolitan Police. Of course we could get them extended to our district without any interference with the boundary of our district by this commission, but really what concerns us is that we are not within the Metropolitan Police District, and that at the present time there is not sufficient protection for life and property in the township. Suppose a man becomes ill at night, and that he wants a doctor, he leaves his house in search of one and he goes forth in the darkness; there is no policeman near because the Royal Irish Constabulary, however efficient for general purposes, are not sufficiently ample in numbers, sufficiently humble in their capacity, or sufficiently ubiquitous to be everywhere; besides all that they don't patrol the roads in the same manner as the Metropolitan Police patrol the streets of Dublin, and that man who leaves his house at night knows not what may occur in his absence, or what outrage may be perpetrated on his family or property.

5384. CHAIRMAN.—That case would hardly benefit by his connexion with the metropolis, but it might be met by his getting the Metropolitan Police extended to his district. Neither of them would help him to get the doctor.

5385. Mr. Killen.—It would give him a sense of security to have the police on the road, and make him feel that he had some protection against those who wish to assail him. I will consider for one moment the objections made to the annexation of Clontarf. With regard to the Fire Brigade, there is no protection at all to a fire brigade in Clontarf. The whole township might be consumed without any person at all interfering. In Rathmines they certainly have a sort of semblance of a fire brigade—a number of men who, though they are amateurs, are willing to work—but Clontarf has not an engine or a hydrant, or anything

at all to be used in case of fire breaking out in the township.

5386. CHAIRMAN.—Is there no hose or hydrant to be used if a fire breaks out there?

Mr. Killen.—None whatever, so that if a fire occurs the whole community might be burned, without any resistance or protection whatever. These are a few of the points which have been put forward by the people of Clontarf, who desire to be annexed to the city, and to have all the advantages to be derived from a city connection. When I say that I mean a large number of ratepayers, and not mere publicans, for they are a small number in Clontarf, but of course they feel it right to protect their own interests, and it will not impinge bad intentions to any memorial because some publicans, who are ratepayers also, have appended their names to it. They are members of the community as well as any other persons in the township, and they have a perfect right to protect themselves, and the mere fact of their names being attached to a memorial should not violate the virtue and good intentions of the memorial. It seems an extraordinary thing that any persons should have endeavoured to influence you (I know, of course, they could not) by mentioning that the memorial was simply got up by the publicans of Clontarf. It seems a very audacious and a very cowardly proceeding. The Commissioners of Clontarf have now an opportunity of coming forward to repudiate the statement. They have not done so, but a notorious representative, or a person who assumed to be one of those representatives, came forward to deny my right to appear here at all.

5387. CHAIRMAN.—This is, of course, meant for you, Mr. Saunders, and Mr. Killen states what was the fact. The other day you asked Mr. Killen by whom he was instructed, and he told you, but you as representing the Clontarf Commissioners, denied his right to appear. Yesterday morning, however, Mr. Fitzgerald, who says he is acting as solicitor for the township of Clontarf, and says he has been so for some time, and that no one else has any authority to appear professionally on the part of the Clontarf Township Commissioners.

5388. Mr. Saunders.—It is very easy of explanation. The firm I represent (Messrs. Casey and Clay) carried this Clontarf Act originally. I was here on the first day, and saw no one representing Clontarf Commissioners, and I was under the impression at that moment we represented that body. That was why I thought it right to make the observation I did on the first day when Mr. Killen first appeared. That night I wrote to the Chairman, and it was brought before the next meeting of the Board, and they thanked me for what I had done, but stated that they did not intend to be represented at the inquiry.

5389. Mr. Killen.—And you very kindly assured that I was representing no one at all, when I said I appeared for a number of ratepayers.

5390. Mr. Saunders.—As to the memorial, I think it speaks for itself, without my saying anything at all about it.

5391. Mr. Killen.—It does, and that far more eloquently than you can. We have put forward our statement plainly and boldly, and the Clontarf Commissioners have not appeared here to meet us.

5392. CHAIRMAN.—Don't take it for granted they don't intend to appear.

5393. Mr. Vernon (Chairman Clontarf Commissioners).—I am here.

5394. CHAIRMAN.—The Commissioners of Clontarf appear to have been under the impression that the proper time to come forward was when we held our inquiry in their township, but in order that they should not be under that impression we informed them yesterday by letter that they were at liberty to come and appear here to-day, and accordingly Mr. Vernon came forward, and said that his Board are opposed to annexation. Therefore the matter stands thus—the Corporation don't want you at all, the Town Commissioners don't want any change, while you are going, on the part of a

number of independent ratepayers, to show why we should annex you.

5395. Mr. Killen.—I could not understand the kind of shuffling behaviour that has gone on in this matter.

5396. CHAIRMAN.—I don't see that there has been any shuffling. Messrs. Casey and Clay being the Solicitors whose name appeared on the back of the Clontarf Bill, thought they still represented the township, but that, it appears, is not so, as the Commissioners do not desire anyone to appear for them. They are satisfied to state their own case. Are all these people who have signed this memorial ratepayers?

Mr. Killen.—Yes.

5397. CHAIRMAN.—As an allegation has been made that a number of publicans have signed it, how is the fact?

Mr. Killen.—Seven publicans altogether have signed it, and why should they not sign it as well as anybody else?

5398. CHAIRMAN.—The ratepayers who have signed that memorial, and the publicans have asked for annexation, but suppose we recommend it, subject to certain conditions, such, for instance, as that the Sunday Closing Law should remain unchanged in the township—would they still ask to have the district annexed?

Mr. Killen.—That is a matter for themselves to consider, and whether they want the benefits of the Sunday Closing Act extended to their district is a matter for future consideration.

5399. CHAIRMAN.—But that may be a very important element to consider where you propose to increase the Metropolitan Police District. The terms on which these people are to be brought in should be discussed, and this question of Sunday Closing is a very important element, for they may be brought in and be subject to the terrific nuisance that exists in other places, such as Killiney, where the police district ends. There you have the public-houses open on Sundays, and you have all the people from the outside district, Loughlinstown, Ballybrack, and so on, flocking up to Killiney for drink, to the thorough annoyance and injury of the neighbourhood—now, is it your proposal that Clontarf shall shall be annexed, on the condition that the public-houses are not to be open on Sundays?

Mr. Killen.—I have not been instructed to speak of that matter. I only speak of the advantages of the city, and whether we shall enjoy them or not. As regards these minor matters, I am not instructed.

5400. CHAIRMAN.—But some of these advantages you would not enjoy until the Metropolitan Police District is altered, and that doesn't rest with us. Do you propose that you should be brought into the Metropolitan Police District and pay 8d. in the pound for the Police Force?

Mr. Killen.—We are quite willing to pay the additional taxation, if there be any, for the purpose of getting the same advantages as the city. There are many improvements required in Clontarf, some of which I have endeavoured to point out; but you will hear them more in detail from the people who live there, and who daily feel the want of some of these blessings which the citizens enjoy. It is not the publicans of Clontarf only who would benefit by any measure like this, but the inhabitants generally. Of course, the publicans, as ratepayers and residents in the township, have an interest in this matter, just as much as any other person; and with regard to the opening of the houses on Sundays, that is a matter I have not considered at all. I presume the publicans of Clontarf, and any other place, would like to have their houses open on Sundays, but that is a question I don't wish to consider at all. I am not instructed as to it, and I don't think it arises at present. Besides, if you look at the matter closely, and observe the position Clontarf holds towards the city, you will see that the question of the public-houses and Sunday Closing can affect the people of Clontarf very little, for they are close to the city, and if the want drink, it is only a matter of excursion into the town, across the bridge. The distance between Clontarf and the city is only a few minutes

walk, and I don't think that even if the houses in Clontarf were opened on Sundays, it would interfere very much with the morality, the good order, and quietness that prevails there either on Sunday or any other day of the week. There is another matter I wish to speak on before I conclude my observations; that is the question of taxation. Of course a considerable amount of trouble is arising in the minds of the people of Clontarf with regard to the question of taxation. The idea is that if Clontarf was annexed to the city, there would be an immense increase of taxation. It is a very singular thing—and I am very happy that Mr. Vernon is here to corroborate what I say—it is a very singular thing that the men who oppose the annexation to the city of Clontarf, are the men who opposed the formation of Clontarf into a township. Amongst those men prominently was Mr. Vernon, and on the very point of the increase of taxation, supposing the taxation was increased, I am sure that Clontarf, being a district in rather good circumstances, in which there are no working people living there, as a general rule, the people who live there generally being well off—merchants living in the city, and making their money by the city—they are exceedingly well able to pay a much larger amount than they pay at present. All the articles of daily use that are consumed by the people of Clontarf, are got from the city. The Dublin people go out to Clontarf a great deal in the summer time, for it is a most desirable place of seaside resort, and in that way make use of the roads of that township; and, especially, do the people of Dublin make use of the roads on the race days at Baldoyle. On such occasions the traffic over the roads of Clontarf is very great, indeed, on the part of the people of Dublin. Under these circumstances, I think that if any advantages at all are to be derived by the people of Clontarf from a connexion with the city, I think that their wish should be acceded to. There is no opposition at all on the part of Clontarf Township Commissioners—no formal opposition—there may be individual opposition. I know what official dignity means. I know what official importance means; and I know what a desire to maintain one's wealth by a sort of Caesarian authority means; but, at the same time, there has been no formal opposition at all to this application of ours. There was an opportunity given to the Commissioners to come forward and make opposition to this application, and they have not availed themselves of that opportunity; and I therefore think, Mr. Commissioner, with all due respect for the Clontarf Commissioners, that as it is the wish of a great number of ratepayers, that Clontarf should be annexed to the city of Dublin, I think that wish should be complied with. With regard to the number of names attached to our memorial, they are certainly a small number, considering the population of the district—but they are representative names—they represent not merely publicans, but men of property, and men occupying various employments; and I complain that any exertion should be made on the part of certain individuals to impose upon you by endeavouring to make you form the impression that it is simply a publicans' memorial. I say it is quite the reverse. It is a memorial of the people of Clontarf, and not merely a memorial of publicans; and the great majority of those whose names are on the memorial, occupy a variety of civil situations, not of a publican character at all.

5401. CHAIRMAN.—With reference to your statement as to the Clontarf Commissioners not having taken

any step to oppose your application, your impression on the subject is quite an erroneous one. I have not the original letter before me now, but I know that we did receive a resolution, or a copy of a resolution, against annexation, passed at a meeting of the Town Commissioners on the subject. (See Appendix No. 21.)

5402. Mr. Killen.—I would ask are the Commissioners of Clontarf such a high and aristocratic body as to be able to exclude popular opinion on a question of this kind?

DUBLIN.
May 23, 1879.
Mr. John E. V.
Vernon, D.L.

DUBLIN,
May 26, 1879.
Mr. John E. V.
Vernon, Esq.,

5403. CHAIRMAN.—No one suggesting that they are, but you persist in saying there is no opposition on the part of the Clontarf Town Commissioners, when, as a matter of fact, they had sent us a resolution passed at a meeting of their body so far back as the 1st of April, stating that they do and will oppose annexation, and they have also stated that, if necessary, they will authorize counsel or some other professional person to appear before us here.

5404. Mr. KELLY.—But they have not done so.

5405. CHAIRMAN.—No matter about that, they will do so to-morrow. For instance, Mr. Vernon has been waiting some time to give his evidence. However, I'm only saying to you don't take for granted that there is not any opposition on their part, for there is. The Secretary of the Clontarf Commissioners having informed us that his Board did not know that we would take evidence on the subject, we wrote, stating that we would hear the evidence here, and, accordingly, Mr. Vernon came here about it to-day, and I told him we would hear their case to-morrow in answer to your evidence. We will take your evidence now, asking to be annexed, and you may examine any number of witnesses you like from Clontarf on that subject.

5406. Mr. KELLY.—Permit me to read a letter sent to you back on the 31st of March to Mr. Vernon, in fact, to the Commissioners of Clontarf, by the Secretary of the Clontarf Ratepayers Committee.

"Committee Rooms, 2, Marine Crescent,
Clontarf, March 31st, 1879.

"To J. E. V. Vernon, Esq., &c., &c.:

"Sir,—On behalf of the Committee I beg leave to enclose a copy of the memorial which they intend to present to the Lord Mayor and Corporation of the City of

Dublin. A deviation from them proposed waiting upon you this week, to ask your support to the prayer of it, and to give any further explanation of their views that may be necessary. May I request the favour of a reply, saying on what day and at what hour it would be convenient for you to receive them.

"I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

"ADAMS' AMBASSADEUR, Secretary.

* (Signed on behalf of the Committee)."

Mr. Vernon's reply to that letter is as follows:—

"Carlton Club,

London, April 3rd, 1879.

"Sir,—Owing to my absence in London, it is impossible for me to attend to your despatch the interview you ask for, but I have not the smallest objection to state for their information that my views on the subject of the proposed memorial are so entirely opposed to those your Committee have adopted, and most of the representations set forth in the memorial appear to me so thoroughly at variance with existing facts in connexion with Clontarf, that under no circumstances could I feel myself at liberty to give them my support. It would be sufficiently evident to any unprejudiced mind that, to throw the district within the scope of the municipal boundary and its enormous taxation, would be to impose as onerous burthen and a cruel injustice on the ratepayers, without any corresponding advantages. The gabbins alone would benefit by the change of administration—class of the community, in my opinion, the least deserving of consideration in connexion with the sanitary and moral condition of the district. I trust your Committee will excuse my speaking so plainly on the subject to which they have invited my attention.

"I am, sir, faithfully yours,

"J. E. V. VERNON."

Mr. Edward
H. Moore.

5407. CHAIRMAN.—What do you wish to state?—My opinion is that if there be any change made in our township the management of it—and the Corporation, too—be transferred to the Government, and such a

MR. EDWARD H. MOORE EXAMINED:

change will receive all support from us—so far as being transferred to the Crown is concerned.

5408. You would not be transferred to the Corporation?—Certainly not; it is better to have the devils we know than the devils we don't know.

Mr. B. N.
Hydes.

MR. BARTHOLOMEW N. HYDES EXAMINED.

5409. Mr. KELLY.—You are a ratepayer of Clontarf?—Yes. I wish to say, as a remark has been made that those who are giving evidence in favour of annexation of Clontarf come to do so for the purpose of serving the publicans—I wish to inform you that I am a superannuated Government officer, and quite independent of all parties, and I have no object in coming forward here but the discharge of a public duty.

5410. You live in Clontarf?—Yes, for 15 years.

5411. You are an owner of property there?—Yes.

5412. You signed this memorial in favour of annexation?—Yes.

5413. What is your opinion on the question of annexation?—Well, as to the question of Clontarf being brought into the city boundary, it is, I believe, clear that it is better to be under the government of a large, powerful body like the Corporation of a large city, than under the control of a small body like the Commissioners of a small township, whose powers of taxation are limited, and without sufficient power to borrow money to carry out necessary improvements. Such a township is too local, and the management frequently too personal, whereas the Corporation of a large city acts more on general principles. The reason there are not more of the inhabitants of Clontarf in favour of annexation is the bugbear of an enormous increase of taxation. It was so when it was proposed to make Clontarf a township, and then Clontarf was dreadfully off for water, and had no gas either on the roads, or in the houses or shops. Now Clontarf has the Vartry water and gas, and the threatened enormous increase of taxa-

tion has never come forth. Unfortunately, opposition to the Act of Parliament caused a heavy debt of £400,000, I think, towards what they call the costs of the Act, and which was caused through the opposition to it, as far as it went. There appears to be no general drainage of the township. There is a private drain built—many years before it was a township—from my house to the seashore, with which I have connected the drainage of ten of my houses, but I am unable to do so with my remaining houses, which is on the highroad, in consequence of it being below the level of the drain. Of course I could not be allowed to do so even if I felt inclined to go to the expense, because I would have to go into the highway road, and to go a great way into some other private drain. I have had and still have frequent complaints from the tenant of that house, because I have no means of draining it. No doubt there will be an Act compulsory to drain the suburbs of Dublin, which I hope we will have before long. If so, and Clontarf be left to itself, Clontarf will never be properly drained, but the pockets of the inhabitants will. If annexed to the Corporation, with its staff, experience, and appliances, it could be done for, I think, less than two-thirds of the expense. The Metropolitan Police would, no doubt, be very desirable. They are more in harmony with the people, particularly the lower classes, and of course would be more numerous than the constabulary. I have no fault to find with the constabulary in jurisdiction, but there are not enough of them; neither have I with the Town Commissioners. Perhaps I could say, the roads are not well kept, particularly the footpaths. If you stand at Annally-

bridge, one-half of the road belongs to the Corporation, and the other to the township. It is not necessary for any one to inform you which part belongs to the township. I strongly feel, therefore, that it would be a benefit to the township to be brought into the city boundary. If not, Clontarf will lose the benefits of all the improvements that are evidently on the eve of being brought forth; and in all probability, if left to itself, will shortly become a "Deserted Village," comparatively speaking, and I should be looking on at the improvements at the city side of the bridge, but not getting those benefits that I feel I am entitled to. The advantages to Dublin, would, I think, be very great, and I think the Corporation should not lose this opportunity of getting full control over Clontarf, as it may prove to be valuable to the city in many ways. The hangs of Dublin may, I presume, be considered to be the Phoenix Park and the sea, and the sea at Clontarf comes nearer to the heart of the city than at any other part. This might be turned to good account by erecting a bathing place near Annestown bridge. It is under half an hour's walk from the General Post-office, and there is a large population even within that space, let alone the rest of the city, and many of the labouring class would avail themselves of this, and the health of a vast number would be improved, and consequently the poor rate would be reduced. By closing at the two openings in the railway embankment the sea might be kept to any depth required in the space between Annestown bridge and the railway embankment, and that would be better than a dock, as it would not move the sea an inch away from Dublin. Probably you are aware that Mr. Ashby Cooper once said that the flow of the fresh tide coming up the Thames twice a day was one of the things that made London comparatively such a healthy city.

5414. CHAIRMAN.—I find from the return that your taxes last year were 3d. in the pound, or a little over it?—3d. in the pound, 4d. being for sanitary purposes. This year the sanitary rate is only 3d., from which I infer that they are not going to give us so much sanitary attention as last year.

5415. What I understand you to say is that no contemplated increase of rates which would, as far as you could see, be put upon you by the Dublin Corporation would prevent you as an owner of property from wishing to be annexed to Dublin?—No, never; I think the benefits would far exceed the additional taxation; in fact, I am sure they would, because we are at a standstill.

5416. Are you able, as an owner of house property and an occupier, to say that the roads of Clontarf are uncleaned?—They are; I may say that after a good shower of rain no lady can walk on the footpaths near where I live, and if you walk to the post-office from Annestown bridge you will see this brought forcibly before you. "Thus far shall thou go and no farther," because the path is not fit to walk on.

5417. Is there any sewerage work done there?—There is a sort of scraping of the roads, and the dirt is thrown on to the sea-shore. Of course that is not any good, as you must know.

5418. Is there any sanitary staff there?—I don't know. No one ever called on me to inspect my premises.

5419. Is there any looking after drains, cesspools, or anything of that sort?—I have never heard of seen anything of the sort.

5420. How long are you there?—Fifteen years. I may say that some of these houses of mine were in a dreadful state for the want of drainage; some of the houses are let out in tenements, and there are between 30 and 35 people in one house, and two of these houses were so situated that the common privy had neither roof nor door to either of them. I improved them as well as I could, and they are all drained now except one house which I cannot drain.

5421. Where does that house drain to—has it a cesspool?—Yes, it has a cesspool, and unfortunately there

is only a very small yard at the back of that house, and there is an ugly crossing there on the highroad.

5422. Are there lanes behind any of the terraces and houses there in which gentlemen have coach-houses and stables, and these sort of things?—Well, I cannot say, except as to Fairview-avenue. Originally I believe there were stables at the back.

5423. Is the offal from the houses thrown out into the street?—Into the culpit, I presume, and I have seen it thrown on to the roadway, and also into my drain and stopping it. A fountain which the Commissioners were kind enough to put over my drain stopped the draught and put me to considerable expense. They have a shirk over it which does not answer, and it gets full every now and then. Yesterday it was running from that across to the highroad; then after a time when they take that fountain down again they will stop my drain again, and that is the benefit we have of the sewage from the present system.

5424. Are there any slaughter-houses in Clontarf?—I don't know of any. Yes, I think Mr. Fitzgerald, the butcher, slaughters sometimes, but I am not certain.

5425. Are there many poor people living there?—As a rule, the people may be said, with few exceptions, to be humble people—something like myself.

5426. Are there many of the labouring class?—Yes, there are; about from Ballybough-bridge to Richmond: there are a great many.

5427. Does anyone look after the sanitary arrangements of the houses in which they are living?—I never saw or heard of anything of the sort except once from the parish doctor, who attended an old man who lived in a house which does not belong to me, but is near mine. He told me he would report me as not having proper drainage to my houses, and that a holy patient of his had died in one of them. I said to him—"I wish you would, because I would like that subject to be brought before the authorities, as all my houses are drained, and the house where you are now attending is not, and it does not belong to me; I would like the subject to be brought before the authorities." I need not tell you he never reported the matter.

5428. Mr. Kilkenny.—Is the district between Ballybough and Richmond in the Drumcondra township?—I don't know.

5429. Supposing a fire broke out in Clontarf what would you do?—I cannot tell what I should do.

5430. Is there any fire brigade there?—No, and the water is sometimes on and sometimes off when the pump is a distance from the main pipe.

5431. CHAIRMAN.—Is the water turned off straight?—Not that I know of.

5432. Mr. Kilkenny.—Have you been obliged to go to the post-office at night?—Yes, I went lately at night to the post-office after 12 o'clock to post a letter, and from the corner of Mr. Dennehy's ground to the post-office there were no lights, and I met no policeman either going or coming back.

5433. What o'clock do the Commissioners turn off the gas?—Up to that point all the Clontarf lamps were lit in the other part. I suppose they had consented to turn them off.

5434. Are they turned off when they are lit at all about half past 10 o'clock?—It appears to me from what I have seen that they are sometimes turned off when they are most required.

5435. Under the circumstances of there being no lights and no police, would you send out your daughter or your servant to post a letter at 11 o'clock at night?—I might be obliged to do so, but I certainly should not like to, and, of course, I would scarcely say that I do not care about going myself either.

5436. Do you believe that that part of Clontarf is sufficiently protected and sufficiently lighted?—No, I

BOSTON,
May 25, 1882.

Mr. H. M.
Hyatt

DUBLIN.
May 25, 1881
Mr. B. N.
Hyres.

think not; and I think the Metropolitan Police are more in accord with the feelings of the people, and of more service. The constabulary are divided by the lower orders, and I do not think that they are a suitable body for preserving the peace in a city or township. Although they are very good men, they are too much of a military body to perform the common duty of policemen. They are rather above it. But I do not wish by any means to be understood as finding any fault with them.

5437. How many tenants have you?—I have eleven houses.

5438. Did any sanitary officer come to inspect your premises?—I never saw one.

5439. Do you, generally speaking, deal in Dublin for

your daily food?—I do not, because there is a very good butcher and grocer in the neighbourhood.

5440. Mr. Vernon.—You are very severe on the police authorities. How far is the police station from your house—is it more than a couple of hundred yards?—It is a long way from my house.

5441. Is it 250 yards?—Is it 2,000, you mean?

5442. Have you any personal objection to the Royal Irish Constabulary?—Not the slightest feeling against them. They are very good men, but they are not enough, and I don't think they are so suitable as the Metropolitan Police. I am not speaking severely against the police authorities, but I say there is not enough of them.

Ms. James
Dunnelly.

MR. JAMES DONNELLY EXAMINED.

5443. Mr. Allen.—You are in favour of the annexation of Clontarf to the city?—I am.

5444. You are a builder?—Yes.

5445. You are not a publican, I presume?—No, sir, nor would I be inclined by publicans. As far as I am concerned, I would close public-houses every day in the year.

5446. You are an owner of house property in Clontarf?—Yes.

5447. You are the owner of the famous agricultural district between Annadale-bridge and the city?—Yes.

5448. Will you describe to the Commissioners the nature of that district? It has been referred to by Mr. Heron on several occasions.

5449. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Heron said there was half a mile of unbuilt-on ground.

Witness.—The ground I hold was formerly portion of the city estate. (The witness produced an old map of the property.) I hold this small bit west of Annadale-bridge. I have the fee of it. It is ten acres and twelve perches. I built four houses on that plot.

5450. Mr. Allen.—It is stated that between the city and the commencement of Clontarf there is the demesne unbuilt on?—And that is a mistake, because Clontarf proper is down beyond here (pointing to the map).

5451. What is the extent of the frontage of Lord Charlemont's demesne that intervenes between the city and the commencement of Clontarf—about how long is it?—I should say, looking at it on the map, roughly it would be about, perhaps, 1,000 feet.

5452. About 400 yards?—Yes. Clontarf joins the city immediately; there is only the river Tolka between; the red line on the map shows that.

5453. Your piece of ground, then, is immediately adjoining the city?—Yes, the Tolka river divides us.

5454. How many houses have you built?—Four.

5455. And you have space for how many more?—I think about 300; I should say from 230 to 300. I am giving them all a rear of about sixty-three feet, according to the manner in which I have laid them out.

5456. Those houses would be more for the artisan class?—I should say not. They are three-storey houses.

5457. Would you have room for 300 of that class?—I would have room for 230 of the class I have at present, or 300 of a smaller class. I could have let this ground, but I would not let it.

5458. You are very largely interested, but, speaking dispassionately, what is your view about annexation?—I consider we require some protection and sanitation. We have no strength at either at present. The gates have been stolen off my premises, and the police barracks is immediately opposite me. I do business in many counties in Ireland, and I never knew anything in my life so neglected as Clontarf is.

5459. And they stole your gates?—Yes.

5460. Mr. Corcoran.—On that ten acres you have room for over 300 houses!—Certainly.

5461. What frontage would you give those houses?—I would give them a frontage of twenty feet.

5462. Mr. Allen.—With regard to the roads, what do you say to their state?—It is the most neglected place in the world. When I was driving to Coolock lately my horse stuck in the road, and I was hard set to get him out. I have seen horses in a similar plight on the roads there, and to such a degree that they had to be mangled.

5463. What road are you now referring to?—The Malahide-road.

5464. Is that on account of the neglected state of the road?—Yes. I don't blame the Commissioners for it, though; they have not money enough. Three shillings in the pound would never keep them in order, and they have no power to levy more. I was one of the original promoters of this Bill, and it cost a few of us a good deal of time and money to carry it.

5465. What was the cost of the Bill altogether?—A very small sum. Very moderate. We had an undertaking to have the Bill carried for £600, and under no circumstances was it to exceed £800. It was, however, opposed in the House of Commons, and it cost us £3,750 altogether.

5466. Who opposed that Bill most particularly?—Well, the present Chairman of the Clontarf Commissioners.

5467. Was that sum paid out of the rates?—I don't know how it is allocated.

5468. CHAIRMAN.—Yes say that some of the roads are bad, are they ever attended to?—Not still, there is no attention paid to them.

5469. Is not anything done about sanitary matters?—Not at all. People empty seines into the middle of the road, and also over my wall around my premises and step manure. The Commissioners actually gave leave—at least the party who actually discharged the sewage matter into my premises said he got permission from them to do so.

5470. Is a nuisance created?—Yes, an intolerable nuisance, certainly.

5471. And have not the Commissioners prosecuted the man who did it?—I don't know. They attempted to prosecute me some time ago, and served notice on me to abate a nuisance, but the nuisance was actually caused by their men. When I had the pleasure of meeting the Secretary on the spot I showed him that it was their men, who swept the road stuff direct into the open channels attached to my premises, and so stopped the flow of the sewage matter, and created the nuisance that was complained of. I called on the Commissioners to abate it, and after a good deal of debate and fencing they did it. That occurred since Clontarf became a township.

5472. Did they prosecute the men that did that?—Certainly not; their own men did it. I had witnesses to prove it. Then I had, on the 20th of May, a letter, calling on me to repair my own wall—the wall for which I paid.

5473. You say their men did think—Yes, sir, certainly. No question about it.

5474. And you informed the Secretary of that—I—Yes. I have a letter which I will show you. He wrote to me, and I explained to him the fact, and his master had to admit that it was as I stated, and they got the place cleaned out. There has been a repetition of it since then, and I never called upon them to do so. They were the offending parties in that case. I have a letter in reference to Mr. Leigh. He is building three houses on the road there, and on one occasion I saw the road broken up, and traces of the making of a drain across it. I asked him who gave him permission to make that drain, and he said the Commissioners had done so. I thereupon wrote to the Commissioners to ascertain if that was a fact, and they denied it. I then wrote to Mr. Leigh a cautionary letter, holding him responsible for the consequences if he proceeded with the work, and now we are getting some of the results of it.

5475. Did Mr. Leigh discharge the staff from his water-closets into that drain?—Yes, into that drain, and then into the open ditch. In answer to my complaint I received the following letter:—

“Clentor Township Office, 1, Marino Crescent,
Clontarf, 26th February, 1879.

“Sir,

“I am directed by the Chairman and Commissioners to inform you, in reply to your letter of the 22nd instant, that Mr. Leigh did not make any application to the Commissioners through their Secretary for permission to discharge the water-closet sewage from his three houses into the roadside opposite the ash houses.

“I am, Sir,

“Yours faithfully,

“J. Balcoman, Secretary.

“James Donegally, Esq.,

“18, Upper Temple-street, Dublin.”

5476. Was Mr. Leigh prosecuted by anyone for doing that?—Not by me, as yet. But then the Commissioners step out of it in this way—they have a public drain there, of very old standing, which took the water down from High Park, passed through Leed James Butler's property, Richmond Castle, and the Commissioners sent their men to make a vent (that is an opening in the old sewer), and discharged the sewer pipe into that sewer, within about twenty-five feet of my ground, and that old drain conducts it into my premises, and it is impossible that it could go anywhere else.

5477. Is that an open drain as well?—Yes; most awful, and it has not been closed up yet. It is the most neglected place in the world.

5478. Have you got tenants in the houses yet?—Yes, there are tenants. They are let at a very low rent—£16 a year—and the same houses in other places let at £56 a year.

5479. Are the footways in the township attended to at all?—I never heard of their being swept, nor do I believe that they are swept.

5480. Have you seen them dirty?—Frequently, and it is next to impossible to pass over them. There are two crossings, one opposite Ballybough-bridge.

5481. It does not matter; you need not go into that. With regard to the rest of the township, which you may you know perfectly well, are the rest of the houses properly drained?—There is no such thing in it as drainage at all. The drainage is on the strand, and anyone going along it gets the benefit of the smell.

5482. What becomes of the stuff from the ash-pits, and the mire from the stables, vegetable matter, and so on?—Well, the farmers of the district draw that away.

5483. Is it allowed to accumulate for say length of time before it is removed?—It is frequently on the lawns at the back of the Crescent. I have seen huge heaps of manure there.

5484. How long is it allowed to remain there?—I could not say. You were asking me with reference to

the unbuilt-on ground in the township. This is Ballybough (referring to the map). It is one continuous range of buildings all along here to a place called the Big Gun—this is unbuilt ground, too. That is the spot I built houses on, and there is some unbuilt-on ground of Lord Charlemont's.

5485. Notwithstanding that your taxation must be increased if you were annexed to Dublin, is it your opinion that it would be beneficial or otherwise to your own property to be annexed?—Most beneficial. It may be an individual injury, but for the public benefit individuals must sacrifice something.

5486. Do you think it would be a great public benefit?—There is no question, in my opinion, about that, and it must come some day or other. The evil day may be delayed, but it must ultimately come. We must have a system of main drainage in Dublin, and that very soon.

5487. Could your drainage be connected with it?—Yes, certainly. Seven years ago I gave permission to the Commissioners to bring that sewer from High Park, and I would not have given that permission only I had a hope of a main drainage scheme being carried.

5488. Mr. Ashe.—When did you first complain to the Clontarf Commissioners about the sanitary condition of the township?—In 1871.

5489. Did you receive, in all cases, satisfactory replies to your communications?—I received evasive answers. The Commissioners appear to think that they can do as they like. They are lords of the soil, and king of the castle; they can do as they like.

5490. Is it your opinion that there should be a fire brigade in Clontarf?—Well, no, not in Clontarf, as it would not be able to support it. It is tooretched a place, but the Dublin Brigade would do.

5491. Do you think with their present rating powers the Commissioners could perform their duties properly?—No, I have no doubt every shilling they have is expended. But they have not means enough, and they could not support a fire brigade.

5492. Do you think that the residents of Clontarf are so impoverished that they could not pay their share of the general rates of Dublin?—I am certain they would freely and willingly pay. The great majority of the people I happen to know there entirely repudiate the idea of being so utterly impoverished and impoverished, but with the present funds of the Commissioners more could not be done.

5493. You are able and willing to pay your share of the general taxes for Dublin?—Yes; the people are willing—everyone that I have spoken to on the subject is willing.

5494. Even if there was additional taxation imposed upon you by your union with the city, would you object to it in consideration of the additional benefits you would obtain?—Certainly not, as I would not have gone in for the township.

5495. CHAIRMAN.—You say the Commissioners are doing their best, but the money they have does not allow them to do more?—Yes, I am making no charge; they levy the highest rate they can save for sanitary purposes. What I want is to improve the district if possible, and that will have to be done by an Act of Parliament, because the parties at present at the helm would never give their support to it. There is another thing about which I wish to say a word, and that is with regard to the River Tolka. The nuisance of the Tolka river has become intolerable, and as a matter of fact I consider that the Corporation acted unfairly towards Clontarf, because they put a syphon under the canal.

5496. The Corporation?—Yes, the Corporation. They put a syphon under the canal. The sewage master from Phibsborough formerly passed under the canal there at the aqueduct, but the sewage master became so great that the open drain along the canal was unable to carry it off, the same as it did some sixteen or eighteen years ago, and the Corporation considered it better to make a syphon under the canal

BERLIM.
May 21, 1879.
Mr. James
Donegally.

BERLIE,
May 23, 1878.
Mr. Jones
Donnelly.

between Jones's and Clark's-bridge at Summerhill. A large portion of the sewage runs through an open drain on the north side of the canal, and then it goes down by Ballybough-road sewer. The Corporation advertised for a drain to do away with the bad drain at Ballybough-road, and also Mr. Clarke's drain at Poplar-row. I looked at the plans and I tendered for the work, as I was anxious to get material for filling up in connexion with other premises. The specification contained a continuation of that sewer passing on from Poplar-row. The Corporation did not, however, give that work by tender—they carried out the work themselves, and they built a new drain as intended on the plan and specification, but not through Poplar-row as arranged, and they discharged it into the River Tolka immediately opposite my premises, and so caused an enormous nuisance; and the people of Fairview got up a memorial and waited on the Commissioners.

5497. Why did you not inform the Corporation?—I don't like law.

5498. Mr. Parks Neale.—The great bulk of the nuisance goes down the Tolka river now.

5499. Witness.—Now a very large portion of it does, it has been supplemented by the siphon under the canal. We had a good deal of discussion about that, but the Clontarf Commissioners declined to do anything for us—the unfortunate people living in Fairview. We then waited on the Rural Sanitary Authority—the Board of Guardians of the North Dublin Union. They cleaned up their portion of it as far as it went, and then we made a collection, and the Commissioners as individuals, a good many of them put down their names for certain sums, and we went to the Corporation, and I proposed to join the Corporation in getting money to have the work done. They declined. The

rain and snow cleared the place pretty well last winter, but it is accumulating ever since.

5500. Is that another reason why you want to get into the city—to have proper drainage?—Yes.

5501. Mr. Kaffen.—There is a wall running along the seashore!—Yes, from Annaskey-bridge to Dollymount.

5502. Has that wall been blown down in a heavy gale and flood?—Yes.

5503. Did the Town Commissioners repair that by subscription on the last occasion?—Yes; the great floods and east wind blew it down. I repaired it also in 1847.

5504. They were not able to repair it out of the rates?—I think not. I don't think the rates would bear it.

5505. Chairman.—Are there any herb stones on the footpath?—There is a large portion of the path along the seashore not kerbed; nor has it been kerbed for the last 30 years.

5506. It has been stated that Clontarf is an agricultural district. If you had it in the city do you think there would have been more building than there has been—what is your opinion as a man having experience in Clontarf?—I think there would, and it would be a more desirable place for residence; in fact I never would have bought the ground I now possess except for the prospect of its being at some future time within the city. I had that in view, and I trust that it will now be taken in. I may add there has been a large increase of building in Drumcondra lately, and all the sewage passes from Drumcondra passes down to the Tolka, and finds its way to Ballybough bridge.

5507. Mr. Neale.—That is one of the great causes of the pollution. The water there is almost the colour of ink.

Mr. J. Carty.

MR. JOHN CARTY EXAMINED.

5508. Mr. Kaffen.—You are a policeman?—I am.

5509. Do you think a policeman in Clontarf entitled to any consideration on moral or social grounds?—Yes. I think I am entitled to the same consideration from a sanitary and moral point of view, and I am sorry that Mr. Verwan should have thought it becoming in him to make the observations contained in his letter which has been read here to-day.

5510. With regard to the sanitary state of the township, what is your opinion?—I own "The Emerald Isle Tavern," and I own a private house, 1, Fairview-avenue, which I let at £40 a year. During the last three years I have lost three solvent and good tenants owing to the want of sewerage, and the nuisance extending from another public-house called the "Life Boat." They have a w.c. on the top of their back window, and it goes down the whole house by a pipe and empties itself in my back yard at 1, Fairview-avenue. It bursts through my wall into the yard.

5511. Did you ever call the attention of the Commissioners to it?—I did, and I was going to take action. I sent them word about it, but they never visited me.

5512. How long is that going on?—Long before I went there. I am only four years there.

5513. Are the roads改善ed?—The roads from Annaskey-bridge have been recently done inside, but from Annaskey-bridge up to the railway it is impossible, on a wet day or night, with the breakages in the footpath, to walk with any comfort or security. It is ankle deep of mud on the roads continually.

5514. Is there any system of scavenging in the township?—Occasionally I see, when the Lord Lieutenant comes down on his way to the races or for a drive, or on some special occasion, I see the beacons going about. In my own house, "The Emerald Isle," I have no means of emptying my drains.

5515. Is there no sewer?—None whatever; and I

would not be allowed to make one. There is no drainage whatever.

5516. What do you do at present?—I accommodate myself in my own bedroom.

5517. But what do you do with the refuse?—I pay a man to take it away. There is a back lane behind me, and I believe it is thrown there, and it is a perfect nuisance.

5518. Do you mean to say that the filth of your house is allowed to be thrown into that lane?—Yes, and no one looks after it.

5519. Are the houses all let?—Yes, and 11 or 12 houses, recently built, empty into that lane, too, belonging to Mr. Healy, Windsor-avenue.

5520. Have they cesspools?—Yes, in the yards, but emptying out into the lane, and it is in a most filthy state.

5521. Are there any other parts of the township in such a state as that?—Yes, there are. From the railway bridge up to Richmond the township is utterly abandoned and neglected, but beyond the railway bridge it is taken care of.

5522. Why?—Because, as I believe, the Commissioners and all the aristocrats live out there; but Fairview is totally abandoned and neglected.

5523. Is it your opinion that the Commissioners have money enough to do the necessary work if they were inclined to do that?—I think not, and my opinion is that the people of Clontarf who are well-to-do people, and nearly all doing business in the city, are able to pay the rates as well as the citizens of Dublin if they were compelled to do it.

5524. What you mean to say is, that a number of the residents of Clontarf are people who live out there, and have their places of business in the city?—Yes, there are a number of residents so circumstanced.

5525. Is it your view that they reside out there to avoid city taxation?—That is my firm belief.

5526. Do you think it would be advantageous to the general people of the township, including yourself, that you should be annexed to the city, even though it would increase the rates?—Yes; and I say that irrespective of all views about public-houses whatever.

5527. Is that the feeling, can you say of your own knowledge, of any number of ratepayers and occupiers there?—Yes, I believe it is very seriously felt.

5528. And that they would rather pay a little more taxation to be brought into the city?—They would, and no mistake at all about it.

5529. Is there proper lighting in the district?—There is very deficient lighting, and I believe the lamps are put out altogether from a certain date in May to September.

5530. Do you mean not *lit* at all?—Yes, at all, and when the moon is supposed to appear we have no light at all. Coming from the theatre you never see a light at all after twelve o'clock. I was attacked myself not very long since when going home from Annesleybridge to my own house, and I had to run for my life, but, of course, that might occur anywhere.

5531. Did you meet a policeman?—I have nothing to say against the police; the constabulary cannot be everywhere. There are no better men than the constabulary, but they are not numerous enough and are not the class of men for town duty. The Metropolitan Police are better adapted for the civil duties. As for sewerage, Clontarf is utterly in a state of ruination for the want of it.

5532. In your opinion, from your knowledge of Clontarf, that building would increase if annexation took place?—Yes, in Philadelphia Avenue there have been at least fifty houses, I think, magnificent half-villa residences, built within the last four years, and there are only three landlords in that avenue. There is neither kerb stone or footpath in it, and if you walked up there on a wet night you would be ankle-deep in mud.

5533. Dr. Norcross.—When was that road repaired?—I saw no indications of repair since I went to live out there.

BRACKEN.
May 23, 1878
Mr. J. Carey.

5534. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think if Clontarf was properly annexed to—I mean in the way of sewage, sewerage, and sanitary matters—it would be more largely built on than it has been?—Most decidedly it would.

5535. Even though it was subject to city taxation?—Yes, there can be no shadow of doubt about it. It would be as rising a locality as Bushmills, or nearly so, because the tendency of the people is out northwards, in consequence of the quay-wall houses being cut away.

5536. Are you aware that the Corporation are the largest holders of real property there?—I am, and that they own the sick lands.

5537. And that lease of fifty years the Marino and all that property will fall into the Corporation?—Yes, so I believe. I walked upon Mr. Strange's at the Custom House about this business, and he said that if he was living at Clontarf he would support our movement, particularly if the Metropolitan Police were brought out there, and he sent me over to Captain Talbot, in the Castle Yard, for the purpose of getting instructed how to seek for the Metropolitan Police for Clontarf.

5538. Mr. Miles.—Are you aware whether the meetings of the Clontarf Commissioners are open to the general public?—I asked the secretary this morning, and he says they are not open to the public.

5539. Are they open to the Press?—I have never heard.

5540. Do they receive deputations?—Yes.

5541. Did they receive the deputation that has been referred to as a matter of right or a matter of favour?—As a matter of favour.

5542. Who are the sanitary officers?—Mr. Balcombe and Mr. Needham. The tax collector is the sub-sanitary officer, and Dr. Fawcett is the executive sanitary officer, but I never heard there were such officials until this morning, for they never came to look after my place good, bad, or indifferent.

5543. You never heard of their going to look after it, although you reported it?—Never.

Mr. William J. Robinson.

MR. WILLIAM JAMES ROBINSON examined.

5544. CHAIRMAN.—Upon what point do you desire to give evidence?—I wish to call your attention to the portion of the district in which I reside, at the Colas-road. There is no sewage. The sanitary arrangements there are very defective.

5545.

5545. Would you be in favour of bringing into the city boundary that portion of the county?—I would be for annexing it to the adjoining township, Drumcondra, or else annexing it to the city.

5546.

5546. Which would you prefer, then—being annexed to Glasnevin, or with Glasnevin being annexed to the city?—I think it would be shorter to have it annexed to the city. At present we are paying for 2½d. in taxes.

5547.

5547. That is poor rate and all?—Yes.

5548.

5548. Would you object to pay a little more for the purposes of being brought into the city?—Certainly not. We have no lighting whatever.

5549.

5549. Have you the Vartry water?—Yes; and we pay £4. 5d. for it. I was obliged to call the attention of the Local Government Board to the state of the sewerage in the district. I first called the attention of the sanitary officer to it, and I received no reply from him. I then communicated with the Local Government Board, and at my request they had it examined. At first the existence of a nuisance was denied altogether, and I have in my hand a report that Mr. Banks sent me from the medical officers.

5550.

5550. Was it proved that there was a nuisance?—Yes; and it continues unabated.

5551.

5551. Did they act after that?—Yes, they served me with a notice to take up a public sewer, which I didn't do.

5552.

5552. That is the fault of the county?—Yes, but there is no use complaining in that quarter. I put in a presentation on one occasion for the repair of the roads, and one of the magistrates said it was only a waste of time looking for it. It is from eighteen to twenty-three inches over the surface of the roadway, and at present the kerb stones are lying in that way and have been so within the last three weeks.

5553.

5553. Have they fallen out from their places into

BERLIS.
May 31, 1878.
Mr. William
J. Roberts.

the public road!—Yes, so that any person driving out at night would be liable to be thrown off his car.

5568. Dr. Newwood.—How is the upper part of the Cables-road!—The upper part is exceedingly bad.

5569. What is the opinion of your neighbours about annexation?—Some of them wish for it and others don't, and some of the landlords don't.

Mr. J. Jackson.

5570. CHAIRMAN.—What is your profession!—A builder.

5571. Where do you reside!—I live in the city, and own some property in Clontarf.

5572. What is your view with regard to annexation?—In regard to the question of sewerage, sometimes in the winter there is nearly a foot deep of water in the basements of the houses for want of drainage and that on high ground, on the Malahide-road a good piece away from the Strand.

5573. As far as you know what is the condition of the roads of the township!—The road is very bad there. I have several times gone out to collect my rents, and I could scarcely cross the roads they were in such a state.

5574. Is the scavenging attended to!—Not at all.

5575. Is there any sanitary arrangement!—There is no such thing at all looked after. In fact some years ago I invested a sum of money elsewhere from the state it was in. I built in the city. I invested a sum of £8,000 or £10,000 then. Instead of building in Clontarf I built on the south side with the expectation that all the townships would be taken in, as a matter of course, and I think it is only a matter of time.

5576. As a builder are you able to say of your own knowledge that building has gone on in the townships from the fact of the taxation being light, and that people go out there to build on that account!—It is in Rathmines people go out there to build to escape taxation, but in Clontarf I think there is very little inducement for going out there.

5577. Is it your idea that if it were annexed there would be more building in Clontarf!—I believe there would. I believe all the townships would be improved by being annexed to Dublin.

5578. Mr. Clegg.—I wish to mention that my cellular am for several months in the year with three feet of water in them.

5579. Is that from the want of proper coverage!—Yes; and it is so in both my houses.

5580. Mr. Mark G. Berney.—I wish to make a personal explanation. I was absent yesterday, but the Chairman of the Rathmines Commissioners reported in one of the morning newspapers to have made a statement by way of a correction of a statement I made

5581. Do you know any of the facts about the Circular-road!—I know some of the facts.

5582. Do you know that the ratepayers wanted to have that kerbed and couldn't get it done!—Yes; until this year.

Mr. JOHN JACKSON examined.

here. The following are the words used, as reported in the newspaper:—

“Mr. Fettell, Chairman of the Rathmines Town Commissioners, said he wished to correct a statement made by Mr. Mark Bentley at his evidence the day previous. Mr. Bentley had said that when an election of members took place, it was the custom of the Commissioners to send circulars to the ratepayers, asking them to vote for certain candidates. He (Mr. Fettell) thought it only fair to state that that was quite a misrepresentation.”

5583. CHAIRMAN.—With reference to that, Mr. Fettell understood you to have stated that there was a sort of “House List” sent round whenever there was an election, as if coming from the Town Clerk's office or the office of the Town Commissioners. He said what occurred was this—that when five, or six, or seven gentlemen went out of office, they sent out a circular of their own, but that the Commissioners, or Clerk, or anyone else on the part of the Board did not interfere in the matter.—Well, sir, the outgoing gentlemen sent out a circular, which in former days was generally prepared by Mr. Stokoe. Ever since he left the Board, it has been prepared by the gentlemen themselves. I stated that at each election the Board combined to return the outgoing gentlemen (Mr. Fettell won't deny that), but I further stated, and repeat, that on the occasion of the last election the members of the Board sent out private circulars. I saw one in print, and I heard they were sent all over the township. Of course they didn't send one to me. I saw one signed by Dr. Ward, who is a member of the Board. It was a printed circular with a blank for the signature, and it was to this effect, that the sender would feel under an obligation if the gentleman whom he addressed would come and vote for the candidate of the Board.

5584. For the candidate of the Board!—Yes. I don't say that Mr. Fettell was at all aware of that; on the contrary, I heard from Mr. Evans two days afterwards that Mr. Fettell and Mr. Parker did not take any part in the election beyond Mr. Fettell's duties as chairman. I may add that I myself voted for Mr. Fettell. That is the explanation I wish to give.

Mr. JAMES DOOMESDAY re-examined.

Mr. James
Dowdell.

5585. You wish to add something, I believe, to the evidence you have already given!—I wish to say, in reference to what has been mentioned about Grangegorman, that I am also in favour of the annexation of that district to the city, and there are a great number of ratepayers there who, to my knowledge, are also in favour of annexation.

5586. And you think it would be desirable that Grangegorman should also be added to the city!—Most certainly; we were something like twenty-five years

trying to get something from the county in the shape of a footpath.

5587. And you cannot get the county to do anything!—Nothing; I took about 400 tons out of my quarry at Cables, and the roads were almost impassable; in fact, so bad were they, and so easily were my horses tired when drawing over them, that I had to repair them at my own private expense in order to enable my horses to travel over them.

The inquiry was then adjourned.

DUBLIN.—TWELFTH DAY, MAY 24TH, 1879.

ARTHUR H. ROBINSON, Secretary Penbecks' Township Commissioners, recalled.

DUBLIN.

May 24, 1879.

Mr. Arthur H. Robinson.

5578. CHAIRMAN.—I saw in the printed account the other day that there was an apparent debt at the end of last year of £2,958 9s. 3d., which would require an 8*½*d. or a 9*½*d. rate to pay it off. What is the cause of that debt?—Since the year 1853 we have had a floating debt every year. Each year we have been presenting for the amount of our debts and liabilities, but as each year advances some striking improvement presents itself to the Commissioners, and they never hesitate to enter upon it, even although it will cause an apparent debt at the end of the year.

Rev. LOFTUS T. SMITH, Senior Curate Trinity Church, Bathmains.

Rev. Loftus T. Smith.

5582. I desire to give evidence. What brought me here to-day was a letter I received this morning from Mr. Bentley. I am decidedly opposed to amalgamation with the city. I believe it would be ruin to our property in Bathmains, and I am not one of those who wish, to use a common phrase, to go from the frying pan into the fire. Mr. Bentley made a statement here on my authority in reference to crossings at Bathmains Church, and I must hear Mr. Bentley out most fully in what he said. It was after the greatest fighting I could get one crossing to my church.

5583. CHAIRMAN.—Have you not got a second crossing there yet?—No. I sometimes got a pathway of gravel made across the road, and when this is beaten down the mud is then allowed to accumulate, and on Sundays especially, so that it gets over your shoes. Of the crossings at the other three angles of the church I have complained from time to time, and the Commissioners have sometimes directed their men to look after these crossings on Sundays, but they are grievously neglected. I have taken no active part in the affairs of the township, for I have been the resident clergyman there for twenty-eight years, and I have been surprised at some of the statements made by Mr. Evans and Mr. Johnston. Mr. Evans has stated that the Commissioners were not opposed to having a public audit of the accounts. I was the first gentleman who was active in the matter, and when we presented a memorial to have a public meeting called it was found we had not stated the particular section of the Act under which we wished to proceed, and I believe I am correct in saying legal opinion was taken at the expense of the township to defeat us on that technical point, and we were defeated at the time. Sometimes after another memorial was gotten up, and everything was put in apple-pie order. They had not a loophole, and the way they met us was this—They met punctually at the moment. I was unable to attend there, as I was attending a funeral, and before any of the gentlemen who were anxious to have this motion carried out could attend they went through the form of passing it—by the Chairman and one or two of the Commissioners.

5584. CHAIRMAN.—At what o'clock was their meeting held?—A boat ten o'clock or earlier, it might have been for all I remember.

5585. How are the streets of the township kept?—I am sorry to say very badly indeed.

5586. And with regard to the sanitary arrangements?—They are much better than they used to be. Although I have seen it stated the streets are kept very clean, yet I have often seen three inches of mud on our public streets, and it is the only ground on which a step could be taken to annex us to the city, for we are no longer clean Bathmains, but dirty Bathmains.

5587. Is it on the ground of fear of increased taxation you object to amalgamation?—Yes, and on account of the management. Our management is bad, and must be bad as long as the Board have the power of co-option, and as long as those gentlemen who retire have the combined influence of the Board used to bring them in again next year against the wishes of the ratepayers.

5579. You never hesitated, knowing the number would pass it as a matter for the welfare of the district?—We have always kept well within our Act.

5580. And that is the way the debt has been caused?—Yes.

5581. It is not anything out of last year's accounts brought forward?—No. A rate of 8*½*d. or 9*½*d. would wipe it out.

5585. From your knowledge of the township do you say there is a feeling or opinion amongst the Board in favour of getting the outgoing Commissioners in again?—Most decidedly; and they work for that purpose. I have been called upon and written to by members of the Board, and not only that, but the Board have combined and have sent their carriages to bring up electors.

5586. I can only say the reverse was stated in the most positive manner?—Well, I state that in the most positive manner, not only that, but I have been obliged to call their officers to order outside the polling booth for interfering with the election.

5587. Do you mean that their officers interfered with the elections?—They did whenever they possibly could, whenever a gentleman was not present. They thought to exclude me, but as resident clergyman I have taken an active part, as I consider it was my duty to do, in the township. I have little property in it, but I was opposed by some of the Commissioners because as a clergyman I took an active part in these things.

5588. Mr. Heron, q. e.—Do you remember the majority the Board had at last election?—I don't know. I did not take an active interest in the last election, because of the combination of the Board against us and the conduct of the officers, and because if we put out a name some member of the Board ranged and he was brought in again by co-option.

5589. Could Mr. Evans tell the majority at the last election?

Mr. Heron.—I could not give the exact number.

5590. Mr. Heron, q. c.—Was it a hundred?

Mr. Heron.—It was more, certainly.

5591. Rev. Mr. Miers (examination resumed).—It was much more. I think it a very grievous wrong that we don't know how our affairs are managed, or what Commissioners take an interest in our business. I think the public press should be admitted to such a body as the Commissioners, and that we should have some summary of their proceedings in order to enable us to judge of what they are doing for us. I think it is an absurd thing for any gentleman looking to the composition of the Board to say that if the press was admitted there would be anything of specificizing. I would like to know which gentlemen are the masters except our late chairman. There may be some gentlemen who are thought so, but they are retiring into private life after having done a good deal of mischief. As to the Fire Brigade, it is a monstrous thing that nothing is done to provide a fire brigade or to get help from the city. That would be perfectly useless too if we had not a better supply of water. On the road I live on—Palmersonton-road—the elevation is not very high, it is a little ascent, and because it is at all high we could not have a drop of water in some of the closets on it. About four years ago we presented a memorial to have a supply of water brought down from Palmerston Park to the gate, and it was at once refused, but now they have done so. Just at the last election at an expense of £3 or £4, and we have a better supply now.

DURHAM.
May 16, 1878.
Rev. Latimer E.
Shire.

5595. CHAIRMAN.—Would the ratepayers object to pay a little more rate for more cleanliness and better sanitary arrangements?—No. We are both cheap and dirty, and we have been accumulating a debt illegally. I have caused bringing anything before the Board because our letters were not brought before the Board.

5596. Do you mean that the remonstrances you made were never answered?—Merely formally, and they were decided by the ex-chairman and the officers connected with the Board. I have learned from gentlemen who attended the meetings that our letters were not brought before the Board.

5597. Do you mean you heard this from Commissioners?—Yes. I have stated the Commissioners act illegally. I hold in my hand a report for 1873.

5598. Dr. Hermon.—This is a report of the Commissioners?—Yes, and in 1873, three months before they were legally entitled to do it they struck a rate for Rothmines, and collected upwards of £5,000 of that rate and spent it. I attended at a meeting where we were called to consider that report. We discussed their right to act as they had done, and I brought Acts of Parliament forward, and I showed them from the Acts of Parliament that they were acting illegally, and that they were bound to lay aside £500 every year to meet their debts, and that they were not doing it, and we brought the matter to a crisis by proposing a vote, whereupon Mr. Stokoe, who was then chairman, and just after being elected by the Board, told us plainly we had no right there, that it was only a matter of courtesy we were there at all, and when we wished to take a decided step in the matter we would not be allowed.

5599. CHAIRMAN.—Did any of the Board remonstrate about that?—Yes; not only that, but there is one of the gentlemen, who is now ill, who agreed to take legal proceedings to quash the rate. He was one of the Commissioners, and we were going to take legal proceedings and to raise funds for the purpose when he was got about in some way, and the matter fell to the ground. Mr. Johnston has stated there are no cesspools in the township connected with houses.

5600. That is as far as he knows?—Then I am sorry to say he must be very ignorant of the affairs of the township.

5601. Are you able to say the reverse?—I was some years resident in Castlewood-avenue, and all the houses on the left hand side up to a certain number had cesspools.

5602. Mr. Heron.—Since that public sewer has been put into the road how many of the houses have been connected with it?—I could not say.

5603. CHAIRMAN.—Are you able to say they are not connected because Mr. Johnston says every house in the township is attached to the new sewer by drains from the houses I asked him was he aware of that of his own knowledge?

5604. Mr. Heron, q.c.—And Mr. Shire says he knows there are cesspools attached to these houses. Were these cesspools at the rear of the houses?—Yes.

5605. CHAIRMAN.—And is the sewer in front?—Yes, it was in my garden, where I lived for three and a half years.

5606. Mr. Heron, q.c.—Mr. Johnston says every house in Castlewood-avenue is attached to the new sewer by drains. I know others have told us it is not the fact?—Well, a year and a half ago the military chaplain resided in Castlewood-avenue and he got typhoid fever—he was three months ill—he has since left, and the house could not be let until it was connected with the main sewer.

5607. Then the house was not connected with the main sewer?—No, another complaint is the keeping of Leinster-road as a private road. The Commissioners say they have a rule as to making private roads, and that unless they are given up on the condition they require they will not take them up as public roads at all. I built a couple of houses on Palmerston-road some years ago. The road was then only opening up, and because there was not a main

sewer put into the road, whilst there was a main sewer at the rear of the houses, that road was left in a fearful state; and I have at night gone up to my knees in water in the darkness trying to get down to my church, and I could not get anything done. At the present moment there is not £10 a year spent on the road.

5608. CHAIRMAN.—That is on Palmerston-road?—Yes.

5609. Mr. Johnston says it is kept in splendid order?—We have at one side (it is their due to say so) asphalt, but if I am to get to that I must cross the road, and there is not a single crossing on the road.

5610. How long is the road?—It is better than a quarter of a mile. The whole road is between a quarter and half a mile.

5611. What do you say about Leinster-road?—Whilst Palmerston-road was neglected because they said you have not put a main sewer in it, there being a splendid sewer behind the houses, the Commissioners spent our money on Leinster-road which was a private road.

5612. Mr. Corres.—Where did the sewer in Palmerston-road run?—It was behind the houses to Dunville-avenue. It was originally intended to run the sewer at the rear, and so the sewer was built there, but they wanted it in front.

5613. CHAIRMAN.—There is nothing to compel the drainage to be carried to the front if you have got a good sewer at the rear?—It has been stated our road is kept in good order; well, there is a specimen of the graveling on the walk on our side of the road (produces paper-full of stones).

5614. Do you mean that these were on the footpath?—Yes, there is a specimen of the graveling on the side of the road I have to walk down.

5615. Of course in the discharge of your duties you have to go all over the township; are you acquainted with the laws?—Indeed I am.

5616. Are they kept in a filthy state?—I would not say they are in a filthy state now, but they are not as well attended to as they ought to be; but they were in a filthy state, and I brought the matter before the Commissioners, especially the district connected with Old Mountpleasant-avenue and McGregor's nursery, where, I told them, I was obliged to walk up to my ankles in filth to get to my sick people.

5617. Was it remedied?—It was not at that time.

5618. Mr. Heron, q.c.—How long is Palmerston-road opened?—I suppose the road is open thirteen or fourteen years. More than that. I know that there was this to be said, Mr. Flunkett opposed at one time the Commissioners in changing the name of the road, and he was brought into the Police Courts on the subject, and afterwards there was opposition to the road; in fact any gentleman who took part to remedy the state of the township met with decided opposition.

5619. CHAIRMAN.—From whom?—From the Commissioners. It was considered a grievous sin for any outsider to interfere with the Commissioners or take an active part in the affairs of the township, and to write on any subject was the surest way of not getting anything done.

5620. When you wrote any letter did you get an answer?—You never got any reform, and the surest way of getting no reform was to unite. If you could coax some of the Commissioners you would have some chance; but the idea of suggesting anything to the Commissioners of Rothmines was real downright impudence.

5621. Did you ever see the agreement under which the Commissioners took charge of Leinster-road?—I saw some form of agreement proposed by Mr. Evans; I believe it referred to Mr. Jackson's time. I went before Mr. Collett, who was the first public auditor, and I pressed the point that the Commissioners had not the power to spend the township money on private roads. Then Mr. Evans produced some agreement. I can't remember exactly what it was. I pressed Mr. Collett for a legal decision of the question,

and he said he could not as it was a matter that should go into court, and so it remained. We think it very bad that other roads should be so grossly neglected when Leinster-road is kept as one of the best roads.

5622. Is Palmerston-road a public road?—It is. There are about forty houses on the road; all new large houses, and I suppose they get every year from Palmerston-road £130 in the way of taxes, and they don't spend £10 on the road in the year.

5623. If the Dublin Corporation were to get a good character would you like to join them?—I would not, excuse me. I would have come here very willingly to give evidence at first if the object was to improve matters in Rathmines, so far as we were concerned, but I refused when I saw the tendency was to annex us to the city. We are much higher valued in Rathmines than they are in the city, and although we have a large debt we have no water supply. The Commissioners are about to spend £20,000 or £30,000 more for water purposes, and if they do, let us get the Vartry—I don't require it myself as I have a large supply of soft water—but as a public man I take an interest in the wellbeing of the township, and I think water is required.

5624. Are you able yourself to speak of this dissatisfaction?—Yes; and to prove another fact I will state—as I have told you already—I have taken an active part in the affairs of the township for sometime, and when they commenced the tar asphalting I wanted to get Church avenue asphalted on one side, but it was refused on the ground it was too wide to asphalt. I went over to Hanbury-road and I showed them the footpath there was half as wide again, and they had asphalted it, but it was refused, and they refused lighting also until I showed we were behind other parts of the township in that matter.

5625. Have you adequate light now?—There is a fault, but I won't say anything about it. I thought, however, that as they were asphalting one side of the streets they would asphalt one side of the avenue, next the Church, but no; there was a hitch about it and so it remained. Just before the last election of Commissioners I brought the matter before my vestry again, and they wanted me to wait on the board, but I said "There is no use. Can't you as a vestry apply to the Board? There is Mr. Grey one of the Commissioners and one of our Board. Can't you bring it forward?" Well, we did, and it was done, and since that three or four carts of gravel have been taken for, but not given, and we are often obliged to walk in the mud on Sundays. Doctor's carriage shelter under the trees there, and it is not at the present moment in a fit state. We have not one single crossing on all our roads, and when anything is attempted to be done the expense is enormous. I am in the discharge of my duty have often been in the habit of looking at the workmen, and it is not very encouraging—whose fault it is I don't know—to interfere with crossings or anything of that kind for the amount expended on one is enough to put down three.

5626. Is there a want of supervision?—We are paying very largely to some of these gentlemen. They have large incomes for what I can't say. I am obliged to work seven days in the week, but some of these officers don't give two hours a day to the business.

5627. Mr. Heron, q.c.—Did you see it stated here that no account is kept of the daily expenditure on the roads or where the money is expended or how?—I had such a press of duty I was not able to read the evidence that was given here, but I know myself about the workmen.

5628. Do you approve of such a principle?—No, certainly not. I have called attention to the way the workmen do the work, that one was sent here and the other there, and the result is you don't get as much done in a week as a man should do in a day. The question has often been asked of me where does our money go. We would expect some return for it but we get none. That is a constant inquiry—last

week it was put to me. I am most decidedly against our going into the city of Dublin, because the result of that necessarily would be that the respectable inhabitants would be driven outside the boundary, and our property would go down. We do not fear any political discussions at our Board. We have no gentleman who go in for such, but we are very anxious to know how the work is done at the Board. I have a letter from one of the Commissioners—I did not read his evidence—but he is considered to have betrayed the ratepayers who put him forward. When these gentlemen are co-opted by the Board they generally are so wheeled round by the influence of the Board (they may be better informed than we are) that it is almost useless to put in any gentleman. This is so with Mr. Essex although he says he is still in favour of everything he promised—Vartry water, the admission of the press, thorough improvement of the drainage, and everything else—but I can't see that he has ever carried out anything in that way. We put him forward because he was in favour of those things. He was not elected, but he was co-opted afterwards by the Board, and whether he has made any effort to carry out these improvements I don't know.

5629. Mr. Walker, q.c.—Now that this has been brought forward behind our backs by this gentleman in such a spirit of charity we want a day for ourselves to contradict every one of the statements made.

5630. Mr. Heron, q.c.—The Commissioners appear to be getting very angry.

5631. Mr. W. G. Bradley (Solicitor).—I intend as a ratepayer of Rathmines to contradict some of the evidence given here, but if there is to be a special day, and we are to be brought face to face, I don't want to say anything behind the back of anybody.

5632. Mr. Heron, q.c.—How could Mr. Walker say this is behind his back. He is here and he has heard the evidence, and it was stated yesterday it would be given to-day.

5633. Mr. Walker, q.c.—I went away yesterday thinking it was over.

5634. CHAIRMAN.—Yesterday Mr. Bentley applied to me as Chairman of the Commission to know whether a gentleman would have a right to come forward in consequence of what appeared in the papers during the Rathmines inquiry. I said they would but they had better write to Mr. Fitzgerald at once acquainting him of the fact that some of these gentlemen would attend here this morning. I tell you what I can do: I will be dispensed on Tuesday and Wednesday next. Mr. Cotton will be obliged to be away, however, but that is no matter as he will have the shorthand writers' notes. Therefore I can give you Tuesday and Wednesday or some days in July.

Mr. Walker, q.c.—I would rather have July as I have made arrangements to go away.

Mr. Bentley.—There was nothing done behind your back.

Mr. Walker, q.c.—I did not say this was done behind our back, but we should be enabled to answer it.

Mr. Bradley.—I wrote to Mr. Fitzgerald last night as the Chairman said I should do.

Mr. Fitzgerald.—I got the letter this morning only.

Mr. Bradley.—I wrote as soon as I could.

Mr. Walker, q.c.—The gentleman who brings gravel in his pocket cannot complain of not being prepared.

Mr. Bradley.—I am sorry I have not some of the gravel off my footpath, but we have no gravel there.

5635. CHAIRMAN.—Either one or both of us can be here on Tuesday the 1st or Wednesday the 2nd July. We will go on to-day and hear anyone who may attend from Rathmines, and then you, Mr. Walker, will know what is to be said in answer.

5636. Rev. Mr. Shire.—The closets on Palmerston-road before they made the change we were taking for four years were all empty of water half of last

DUBLIN.
May 24, 1884.
Rev. Loftus T
Shire.

DEBATES,
May 16, 1879.
Rev. Lettus T.
Shire.

summer. Mine is not quite so high as some of them, but to show what pressure we had I may say that if a watering cart was below on the hydrant at the end of the road I could not draw a tubful of water in my house.

5637. CHAIRMAN.—As to the adjournment there would be this advantage in adjourning for a longer period than until next week, that this gentleman, who is executive sanitary officer, may between this and the next sitting give us an account by notes ascertaining, which is his duty, either through himself or his sub-servient officer, whether all the houses are drained into the main drain or not.

5638. Mr. Waller, Q.C.—I suppose you will be able to give us a copy of the shorthand writers' notes of this?

CHAIRMAN.—Of course.

5639. Rev. Mr. Shire.—Let them take Chelwood-avenue and tell me how many houses there are connected with the sewers.

Mr. William
G. Bradley.

5642. CHAIRMAN.—You wish to give evidence as to Rothmines—I really have very little to add to what Mr. Shire has said.

5643. What is your view as to annexation?—I am one of the minority. I have voted for annexation.

5644. Notwithstanding the Corporation?—Notwithstanding the Corporation. I have seen within the city at all events improvements for the last two or three years, and I think we are as badly managed in Rothmines as we can't be worse off by being annexed to the city.

5645. Do you mind the possibility of increased taxes?—My belief is this: I think the ratepayers if they get value for the money would be perfectly satisfied to pay increased taxation.

5646. Can you say anything about dissatisfaction felt?—Through dissatisfaction in Rothmines.

5647. You live there yourself?—I live in Kendalworth-square, Rothmines; and as far as that district is concerned I have great reason to complain. I have frequently sent forward complaints as to the management of the roads, and the general appearance of that portion of the road near my place, and the secretary invariably has extended to me the courtesy of a reply to my communications which are in his hands, and speak for themselves. I don't know whether they are preserved or not. Certainly I have a great deal to complain of. First of all with regard to the want of water. The water during the day is frequently shut off; we are without any water whatever up in Kendalworth-square. At night, exactly at a quarter past nine o'clock, a turncock, who is certainly a most faithful officer, comes to the very second, and away goes the water, and we have not a drop or a thumbful until a very early hour in the morning.

5648. Suppose there is a fire, is that a pleasant thing?—I know some few months ago in a house in Kendalworth-square the family were nearly being burned out by reason of a fire that took place, and were it not for the tribe of assistance they got from their neighbours goodness knows what would have taken place.

5649. Was that the occasion on which Mr. Hancox described the water as going from the hose in every direction but the right one?—I believe so. We have had two very extensive fires—one at Greenmount Distillery, and the other at some corn mill, and on both occasions we had to get the assistance of the Fire Brigade. Had they taken place at night dear knows what would have occurred. One of them was in the evening.

5650. What have you got to say about the scavenging in the township?—The scavenging is in a most disgraceful condition, the roads and pathways are in an equally bad condition. On the pathways about Kendalworth-square, and particularly round the square, there has not been a load of gravel for I don't know how

5640. Mr. Waller, Q.C.—Could you specify the spot where you were over your knees in the mud?

Rev. Mr. Shire.—Yes, I could—the back of Old Mount Pleasant-avenue; the back of McGregor's nursery. It is now in Dr. Nelson's district. The road could be seen on old Rothmines-road, Upper Rothmines, but we have lost of it now on the other part of Rothmines since the tramways came. By Castlewood-avenue down towards Bonsall-road was in a miserable state, and has been left in Church-avenue for weeks, and I often spoke to Mr. Stokes about it, and he said it costs so much, i.e., or £2. 5d. per load to remove mud.

5641. CHAIRMAN.—And to your own knowledge was it lying there for months?—No: for weeks, and when I have spoken to the Clergyman that was his excuse. We had gravel like that before on our walk, and I took some of it up to the Commissioners at one of the elections, that was beside the church, and this is on my own footpath now.

MR. WILLIAM GEORGE BRADLEY examined.

long, there is no lorking whatever round the square, but there is plenty of mud. I read with the greatest possible sympathy Mr. Murphy's statement as to the amount of money he had expended in the district. He may have buried his money under the sod, but it is not to be seen in any direction. He doesn't reside in the district though a Commissioner.

5642. How then is it scavenged?—The scavengers' carts are like angels' visits. I have had to complain frequently about the scavenging. Whatever arrangement Mr. Murphy makes about the scavenging with the Commissioners I know not, but this I do know, that in autumn the carts of the Commissioners bring up liquid manure to make topdressing for the benefit of Mr. Murphy, and deposit same in the square. The entrance gate into the square is exactly opposite my house, and as I happen to be an early riser, I see the mud brought in.

5643. From other parts of the township?—From other parts for the purpose of making topdressing.

5643. Have you reported that to the Board?—I have. I have known the dust to be allowed to accumulate for inches on the road, and I have known it to be taken to Kendalworth-square for topdressing of Mr. Murphy's square. That square was intended for the benefit of the inhabitants, not only of Bonsall, but of the residents therein; but instead of that he has turned it into a potato and cabbage garden. I have complained of it over and over again. It is monstrous!

5644. Is that a private square?—The Commissioners were in treaty for it; but I understood when the ground was taken originally Mr. Murphy contracted with the parties building houses upon his property there that the square was to be opened for the benefit of the inhabitants; and that it would be laid out in walks, and that the inhabitants were to contribute so much for each bench; but instead of that it is now turned into a cabbage and potato garden, and I believe Mr. Murphy has his vegetables supplied to his house in town from that square. It is very offensive, and I have had no redress.

5645. Did you remonstrate more than once?—Repetitively, and I was told there was an order that no more mud was to be put in there; and last year, instead of the order being complied with, the system was renewed, and then I got an information that the Commissioners would not interfere any more.

5646. Wherever there is a nuisance they have a right to get rid of it, and the idea of their creating that themselves is what I can't understand?—I told them I would apply for an injunction in the Court of Chancery to restrain them, and I will do it.

5647. It is just the same as the case where we had a sub-sanitary officer serving notice on the executive sanitary officer, calling on him to abate a nuisance?—If this nuisance is continued I will certainly apply to the Court of Chancery to restrain them.

DUBLIN,
May 16, 1913.
Mr. William
G. Bradley.

5668. How long ago is it since you complained first?—It is three or four years ago.

5669. Mr. Heron.—Mr. Bradley's letters and answers will all be produced.

5670. Mr. Bradley.—Very well. The lanes are in a filthy condition. I, unfortunately, have no stable, and I am obliged to go down a lane which is almost impassable in winter time. I have frequently spoken to Mr. Sykes, who is a large owner of property in the district, and I asked him to have the kindness to get something done; he stated he had spoken about the lane, but the Commissioners were frightened about the expense.

5671. CHAIRMAN.—Is it a public nuisance?

Mr. Bradley.—It is most offensive, and has been so.

5672. What is the name of that lane which runs at the rear of the south side of Kenilworth-square?—I am not aware what its name is. I was informed by Mr. Sykes, inasmuch as there was no correspondence, the Commissioners had no right to take it up.

5673. CHAIRMAN.—I would like to see any opinion given to them to that effect.

5674. Mr. Heron.—Oh, yes, this lane has been paid for and given up to us, and it is kept in order.

Mr. Bradley.—It is very recently, then.

5675. CHAIRMAN.—Within what time can you speak of the lane?

Mr. Bradley.—Within the last two or three months. I have heard that Rathmines-road is only sweeped twice a week. Now, along the tramway, you cannot get from the footpath to the tramway without going through the mud, which is swept up to the side and allowed to remain there.

5676. How long is it left there before it is removed?—Days. We have not a crossing in the district around Kenilworth-square. I believe all the approaches to the churches in the entire district are without crossings; certainly they are not any at Harold's-cross Church, to which I go, and Mr. Shiro has mentioned about his church.

5677. He says he got one recently?—Well, we have none at all at Harold's-cross Church, which is the church I go to. I look upon the tar asphalt as the most worthless piece of rubbish ever put down. In a very short time it wears away, the cost of repairing and replacing it must be greater than the cost of laying down the asphalt in that model township, the Pembroke, where it is a treat to walk over the footpaths.

5678. We have heard the Board consists of twenty-one members, of whom twelve are owners of property and nine are occupiers of houses. In your opinion does that composition of the Board tend to keep down the taxes of the township and prevent improvement?—I certainly think it does. The district is a landlord's district. There has been a rack rent levied upon the tenants all over the township. It is astonishing the amount the increased rent realises in the district; certainly, so far as the ratepayers are concerned, they have no advantage whatever for it.

5679. And the ratepayers don't pay the rates!—No; the landlords do, and, therefore, every expense of taxes comes out of the landlords' pockets.

5680. And you think the person to tax and pay the tax should not be the same?—Certainly not. With regard to the influence of the Board, I have been a defeated candidate for the Rathgar Ward. That was the only time it was contested, and I was defeated. I don't regret that, for it would have taken up a great deal of my time, but I found the landlords had the whole power in their hands.

5681. It has been stated it is a rule of the Board there is no interference with the elections—that the outgoing men have to work for themselves!—I disagree with that, for the circulars all emanate from the big house on Rathmines-road; they are all identified, and all in the same boat. We have endeavoured to contest the close beneath there. We have not yet been successful, but we are not done with them.

5682. Mr. Heron, q.c.—Mr. Murphy said Rathmines, as regards the streets, might content favourably

with any town except Paris!—I don't know what his ideas may be of cleanliness and neatness, but anything more disgraceful, in my opinion, never could be than the condition in which Rathmines roads and paths are at the present moment. I say Pembroke township is a model township; I say the paths in it reflect great credit on the general management; they are beautifully apaved, and I ask you to picture to yourselves the contrast between Rathmines-road and Pembroke-road. Yet the traffic on the roads of the one is nearly as great as on the roads of the other.

5683. CHAIRMAN.—When you say the state of the roads reflects credit on the township, you mean it reflects credit on Lord Pembroke and Mr. Vernon, for they have made the roads, and the Commissioners spend £s to keep them up, but they had not to make them!—Certainly.

5684. Do you think the streets of Rathmines are in a worse condition than the streets of Dublin?—I think there has been great improvement in Dublin within the last few years. I think the new pavement they have adopted has tended greatly to the benefit of the citizens, and if the Commissioners of Rathmines would pave the sides of the roads where the tramways have left the sides unpaved, it would be very desirable, indeed. As regards water, the Government have within the last year or two laid down a special main along Rathmines-road, and are supplying the barracks with Varty water.

5685. Supplying Portobello Barracks?—Yes. They have laid down a main, and have connected it with Castlewood-avenue, where the main runs down. The inhabitants of the Rathgar-road can also have a chance of getting the Varty, but unfortunately it doesn't come up Kenilworth-square side. As a matter of fact, the Government have laid down a special main from Castlewood-avenue to the barracks, and they are now blessed with the Varty water. That shows what their idea is for the health of the troops.

5686. CHAIRMAN.—We were led to believe there was no Varty in the township.

Mr. Waller, q.c.—Yes, indeed there is.

5687. CHAIRMAN.—It may be in your brief, but I never heard it until now.

5688. Mr. Cotton.—Neither did I.

5689. Mr. Bradley.—Within the last twelve or eighteen months there has been a very large main laid along Rathmines-road which goes up to the barracks.

5690. Dr. Norwood.—I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that it is perfectly illegal to turn off the water at night.

5691. Mr. Heron.—The Varty main runs from Upper Lonsdale street to Terenure. It passes 95 houses on its route, and 134 take a supply from it.

5692. CHAIRMAN.—I never heard of it before.

5693. Mr. Cotton.—We heard that portion of Terenure was supplied with Varty.

5694. CHAIRMAN.—But never that the Government had laid down a main to supply Portobello Barracks.

5695. CHAIRMAN.—And I can understand the reason very well, and I think we might have been told it.

5696. Mr. Bradley.—The parties who take the Varty on Rathgar-road pay the Corporation specially for it, and notwithstanding that they have to pay the same tax to the Rathmines Commissioners for the canal water, it doesn't lessen their water tax; they still pay that and 1s. 3d. in the pound for the Varty, I think.

5697. Mr. Heron, q.c.—Was it the Board of Guardians laid down the pipe for Terenure?—I believe it was a joint expense work.

5698. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know what extra tax these people have voluntarily put upon themselves to get this water?

Mr. Bradley.—I think that information could be had from the Corporation; 1s. 3d., I'm told.

5699. CHAIRMAN.—I did not call attention to that question about the turning off of the water, because it

DUBLIN,
May 24, 1878.
Mr. William
G. Bradley.

was not part of my business, but it appears to be perfectly illegal to do so.

5693. By *Norwood*.—The Act of 1847, which is incorporated with their Act says they shall provide water and keep the township always supplied, so that it is perfectly illegal to turn it off at night.

5694. CHAIRMAN.—I did not call attention to it before, but people, now that they know the law, may take such proceedings as they like to stop the Commissioners.

5695. Mr. Bradley.—Having got that valuable piece of information from Mr. Norwood there may be some communication made to those officials who turn off the water that they shan't do so. We certainly have a great deal to complain of in the general management of things. I see that Mr. Petrell stated that the Board did not interfere with the elections, but that is a perfect fallacy. Everything in reference to elections emanates from the Town Hall, and I think a candidate who is an outsider has very little chance as long as the influence of the Board is set against him.

Mr. Henry E.
Browne.

Mr. HENRY E. BROWNE examined.

5696. CHAIRMAN.—Do you live in Rathmines—I do.

5697. Have you house property there—I have a large house and some ground.

5698. Are you in favour of annexation, or against it—I did not sign the paper because I wanted to hear the matter fully gone into on both sides, but if we can't get what we are looking for—proper drainage and the *Vartry*—I would certainly go in for annexation with the city.

5699. Do you approve of the way the roads and lanes are kept in the township?—Well, the roads are certainly kept indifferently—very indifferently. There is no question at all about it. Besides on our place there is and has been constantly mud.

5700. Where do you live?—A little above Portobello Barracks, and mud has accumulated there continually, and is left to dry and harden.

5701. For how long?—For two or three days certainly. The main thing I am anxious about is the drainage, which I think injuriously affects the health of the residents there. I have had long conversations with medical gentlemen on the subject; and one gentleman, who would give evidence to-day only he is dead, the late Dr. Ladwick, who had property in Upper Rathmines, told me—said he, "Browne, so long as you are supplied with canal water you can't expect to have the township healthy, especially in children, if there is any tendency either to gravel or kidney disease the constant use of the canal water with its mineral deposit would materially affect them." I am a large consumer of water myself, being a total abstainer, and all my family too, and I can't take this water either for cooking, washing, or domestic purposes—it is totally unfit for use.

5702. On account of its hardness?—Yes, that is one reason; but I am not prepared to state as to its mineral impurities. There is one thing quite certain we must have a proper supply of good wholesome water in the township if we are to have our families and ourselves healthy. With respect to the supply to the houses, the house I have is three stories high, and I have frequently had to supply the tank, having a high pressure boiler I am apprehensive of accidents, and during the past winter I had to get a man three times a week to supply the boiler tank, fearing from neglect of the servant there might be accidents. There is not sufficient water pressure to send the water to the cistern—none whatever. The drainage cost me £30 or £40 to drain the grounds, and I don't think it is at present properly done after that expenditure, for I don't think the sewer below is sufficiently low to carry off the sewage.

5703. But they are making a system now which it is expected will make the sewage perfect—I don't think we could expect to have proper representation

5693. CHAIRMAN.—Are you aware the influence of the Board is used in elections?—Certainly.

5694. And is that well known in Rathmines?—Certainly; when Mr. Stokes was there he was the factotum of the whole Board, and I remember the election I was candidate at, Mr. Stokes was working heaven and earth to bring up electors, and all the official staff was used for it.

5695. Mr. *Browne*.—I think that is a very broad assertion.

Mr. Bradley.—I am prepared to stand by it.

5696. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Shire said he saw the carriages of the Commissioners bringing up voters;

Mr. Bradley.—They throw in their influence; we have our eyes, and can see what is being done, at least, I had my eyes and could see it.

5697. CHAIRMAN.—I see Mr. Stokes himself says he would not like to join the Dublin Corporation, and he is asked for what reason, and he says, "In the first place I would rather be first in a village than second in a town."

of public opinion so long as there is such a large financial interest by our Commissioners vested in the canal. I think there should be no gentleman on the Board who has a direct interest in the canal. There is another thing, with respect to the influence of the Commissioners at elections, I could name a gentleman who has voted with us at the last election we stood there who knows Mr. Stokes had to be removed, and I believe it was Mr. Fitzgerald, who stated it was improper for Mr. Stokes to stop in the room where the balloting was, I think Mr. Fitzgerald said it could not be allowed, and an order came down and Mr. Stokes had to be told he should not stay there. I considered that wrong, and I told it to other gentlemen present, as exercising undue influence. The very appearance of Mr. Stokes as chairman had more or less an influence over the election than day. That is a thing Mr. Fitzgerald will bear me out in. I don't see I can add anything to the forcible statement of Mr. Bradley.

5701. As to the lanes?—There is a lane attached to my wall which is very badly kept, and for weeks and weeks there is decayed vegetable matter allowed to remain there; but I particularly go in for the drainage and the water.

5702. Do you agree there are not sufficient crossings?—Yes, there are not sufficient. There is only one crossing from the bridge to my place, and I think the next is at Leinster-road.

5703. Mr. Bentley wishes me to ask do you know is there a combination of the Board to secure the election of individuals?—There is no question at all about it; there is a combination to return the outgoing members.

5704. CHAIRMAN.—Will you take up the Kilmainham case now?

Mr. *Audrey*, q.m.—Yes. I believe you have heard the details connected with the township of Kilmainham, but I will give you shortly the particular in connexion with it, and then bring before you the evidence of some witnesses who will be able to speak as to the matters I will state. As you have heard the signatures over and over again as to annexation, I will not trouble you further on that matter. This map is an enlarged plan from the Ordnance Sheet, and you will see that the township stands out in a little spur by itself at the end of the city. In 1807 the inhabitants brought it under the Town Improvement Act, 1854, and with the view of enabling it to be regulated in a better way than even that Act could give facilities for, they obtained a special Act in the following year, 1858, a copy of which will be furnished to the Commissioners. It is the 31st & 32nd Vic., cap. 110 (Local), which obtained the Royal assent on the 13th July in that year. By that Act the principal general Acts of 1847 are incorporated, and the usual

provisions are contained for the election of Commissioners, and the qualifications of Commissioners and of the persons to elect them. The qualifications for a voter are a rating of £4 a year to the relief of the poor or a lesser of lands rated to the same amount for the relief of the poor; and the qualifications of Commissioners are a rating to the relief of the poor of £12 a year or upwards, or the owner or immediate lessor of premises of the rated value of £50 a year, or, if not resident, being beneficially seated or possessed of profits to the yearly value of £50 or upwards in the township. The Corporation of Dublin are authorized by the 32nd section of the Act, which has been availed of, to supply them with water, at the rate of 6d. in the pound on the Government valuation, the quantity to be twenty gallons per head per day. The rating powers are 2s. 6d. township rate, capable of being increased to £2 6d., with the approval of a meeting of the ratepayers, summoned for the purpose. The water rate is limited to 1s., and they have power to borrow on mortgage sums not exceeding, on the whole, £10,000, £5,000 of which is at the limit of indebtedness in respect of water rate, and £7,000 in respect to the township rate. That being shortly their position under the Act of Parliament, which provides for a sinking fund, and gives them all the powers they require for having slaughter-houses, sanitary arrangements, and all the rest, it is desirable to invite your attention to the position in which the township stands on the map. You will see that the area is very largely built upon. The extent of the area is 534a. 2n. 16r., but I need not trouble you with roads and paths. That is the entire township area. It is thinly populated, because the buildings are not numerous, and the quantity of land unbuilt upon, which is mainly agricultural land, is 340 acres. Now, you will find of the property occupied and built upon, a very large portion, indeed, is that in which the railway company are interested—the Great Southern and Western Railway Company—for whom I also appear as well as for the Township Commissioners; and, in fact, if you take the Great Southern and Western Railway Company's works out of the township, with the numerous houses they have there for their workers, and the Richmond Barracks, the two refectories, the goal, and the courthouse, you will find there is left a small urban population and a very small number of actual residents, indeed. The poor law valuation, in 1868, which was the year in which they obtained their Act, was £6,243. Of course, there was a large number of very valuable buildings included—the railway and other buildings to which I have referred. Of that £6,243, £3,337 was the valuation of agricultural land, or unbuilt-upon land, and land under the railway. That is under the Town Improvement Act of 1854, which is incorporated with the special Act of 1868, and not varied by it, liable only to one-fourth rating.

3710. CHAIRMAN.—Can you divide that?

Mr. ANDREWS, Q.C.—I can, and I will give you the details a little further on. The balance of the valuation of £6,243 would be £3,896, and that would be for buildings. The population by the census of 1861, which was the last census before 1868, was 4,732. We have the valuation and the population according to the return at the time the special Act was obtained. However, the present population is not very largely in excess of what it was then—it is 4,936. That is by the census of 1871. The population inhabits 543 houses, and there is an increase of something over £3,000 in the valuation. Of course since 1871 the population may be presumed to have increased something over what it was then. At present the Poor Law valuation is £8,911, of which you have in land, and land under railway unbuilt upon, £3,431, and the balance, £5,479, is for buildings; therefore the increase since 1867 in the valuation is £2,667. When I come to refer you to the railway I will give you the figures connected with it. There are nine Commissioners; they meet once a week, and they transact business alone; there is a strict prohibition against

DUBLIN.
May 14, 1875
Mr. Henry E. BREWER.

introducing any extraneous matters, such as politics, or matters of that kind. Their present Chairman is Mr. McBrearty, who is an influential citizen of Dublin; their Vice-Chairman is Mr. Ilberry, who is interested in the railway; they have a Town Clerk, a Surveyor, a Collector of Rates, and a Sanitary Office. They have an annual audit by two of the ratepayers. Their former water supply was very indifferent before the improvements which the Township Act and the Commissioners were able to effect. They get their supply from wells and a few pumps, and they got some water from the Grand Canal, but since the Commissioners have taken matters in hand they have, at an expense of £1,200, laid distribution pipes, and get a supply of Vartry, the same as the citizens; that has been done efficiently and economically, and the arrangements made are the same as with other townships—they get a supply from the main through their township, and the cost of the distribution is paid by the township themselves. Their borrowing powers are limited to £10,000—£3,000 being upon the water rate, and £7,000 upon the improvement rate. They never found it necessary to go to anything like the extent of these borrowing powers, but have, by obtaining a loan from the National Bank of £2,890, been enabled to effect their necessary improvements. A considerable part of the loan was spent in the improvements of the water supply. Of course there was other expenditure besides, but I am happy to be able to add that, through the operation of the sinking fund, and the good management, the debt has been reduced to a sum of £500, and that they expect in a very few years to pay all off, and of course when it is paid off there will be a corresponding relief in the rates. The present percentage rates, which have remained substantially the same for the last five years, are 3s. 6d. Of course, in addition to that, they have the poor rate, and police, and bridge tax, which all the townships are obliged to contribute, but the rates leviable under the Act are what I have stated; they are up to the maximum, but they expect soon to be able to reduce them. They obtain their gas from the Alliance Gas Company—the same as supplies Dublin and the other townships; their paving, scavenging, and watering, are properly attended to, and their roads are kept in proper order, and contrast favourably with other townships' roads and the city roads near the district; their death-rate is small—it doesn't exceed sixteen per 1,000, but inasmuch as it is not situated in one registration district, I have not separate returns. But in taking that estimate of sixteen per 1,000 we should take some credit for the fact that a good deal of the Palmerstown district is in the country, away where the death-rate would naturally be lower, but there is no doubt the death-rate is lower. There is a very strong and decided feeling against annexation. A number of inhabitants have petitioned against the annexation scheme, and the persons who have signed that petition have set out their grounds. Their area not being large facilitates supervision, and owing to the supervision which is applied, very considerable advantages, both sanitary and otherwise, are derived. That is generally the condition of the township, fuller details you will get from those connected with the township. I can give you the position of the Great Southern and Western Railway Company's property, which has a good deal to be said in connection with it. The actual area which the Great Southern and Western Railway Company's works occupy is 78a 2n. 27r., or about 76½ acres. Their expenditure upon that has been very great, indeed, and the effect of their expenditures has been to relieve the streets and roads of Dublin in the most remarkable and marked way—by taking away the traffic which in former times had to pass over the roads of the city. The connection with the North Wall will prevent much wear and tear of the Dublin streets. The railway company has expended over £350,394 in the township on works, cottages, &c. The number of cottages which the company possess and look after, and that in a manner which elicits the

BENNETT.
May 18, 1889.
Mr. Harry E.
Bennett

praise of all who visit them, is 148, and I believe there are inhabitants living in these houses to the extent of 860 persons; the Poor Law valuation of the company's property is £3,053. Of that the land and land under railway amounts to £2514, and the buildings to £2,353. Upon the land and land under railway—the £2514 valuation—the one-fourth rate is paid, and upon the buildings and works which are rated at £2,353 the full township rate is levied. In Dublin, as I believe the Commissioners are aware, the railway company pay an immense rate; the rating in Dublin is levied on the full valuation. It may be interesting to give shortly their rates in Dublin in respect of what are commonly called the Kingsbridge premises, which run down and join the boundary of Kilmainham, and are called in the valuation book the Victoria Railway Quay. For the railway premises they pay £751 per annum taxes in Dublin, and adding the North Wall property, which has now become considerable, there is an addition of £163 per annum, so that they are paying to the city in respect of these premises £214 a year. Their valuation in the city alone on these two places amounts to £3,737, which you can easily divide in this way—£2500 is the valuation of the North Wall property, in respect of which they have recently been furnished with a resolution to pay rates, and the balance, £2,237, is the valuation of the property called the Kingsbridge premises.

5711. CHAIRMAN.—Could you give us an idea how much land exactly is occupied by the railway in the Kilmainham township?

Mr. ANDREWS, Q.C.—They occupy 76 acres, 2 rods, and 27 perches.

5712. CHAIRMAN.—But, then, I mean the acreage of the land alone, as contradistinguished from cottages and houses?

Mr. ANDREWS, Q.C.—I cannot give it in acreage, but I can give it in valuation. The valuation is £2,353; and we pay one-fourth rate on £2514, and the full on the balance of the £2,353.

5713. CHAIRMAN.—The way it struck me so strongly was that the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company are valued at close on £10,000 for their land in Pembroke, and doesn't it appear very strange to have this company valued at so little in Kilmainham.

Mr. ANDREWS, Q.C.—The Towns Improvement clause applies to us.

5714. CHAIRMAN.—But the valuation ought to be the same?

Mr. ANDREWS, Q.C.—But the quantity under railway that is not tilled—that is, unbuilt-on land—is only a small bit, the great bulk of the land, as the map will show, consists of the extensive works and buildings in connection with them, the workmen's and labourers' houses, and matters of that kind, which are of a very extensive character there. Sir Croker Barryngton tells me the extent of land under railway is not more than ten or twelve acres, so that the balance is land under the very extensive works. We all know the extent of their works at Inchicore and their surroundings. The only other argument which has been used is one fit to be dealt with certain force on the one side, and has been thought capable of being met with equal force by the townships on the other, and that is the use of the roads of the city; but the argument cannot possibly be applied to the Kilmainham Township, so far as the Great Southern Railway Company are concerned, because their operations and their tendency has been to relieve the roads of immense traffic that would otherwise have gone over them; and the use of the city streets, if you take the railway company out of the case, can't be regarded as of any great moment at all, as far as the other inhabitants of the township are concerned. It must strike the Commissioners that Kilmainham was hardly mentioned at all during the Corporation case. I believe their principal witness scarcely even mentioned its name. I have listened to Mr. Beveridge's evidence, and I did not find him make any allusion to it at all; and it was not until the inquiry had closed

you mentioned that you had heard very little about it; and then there were a few words by Mr. Byrne, who thought they ought, for some reason which was not very clear to say of the witnesses, as well bring it in as not. It has got a good and efficient management, its accounts are properly kept, its requirements are attended to; and it occurs to the Commissioners of Kilmainham that the idea of bringing them in is not justified at all. The objection raised to Clontarf was the quantity of agricultural land it contained, but surely that applies to Kilmainham also; and we feel there is no ground for imposing this additional taxation upon us; for the principle of one-fourth rating and exemption would not apply. We have done as well as we could with regard to the drainage, and we have done a good deal, and there is a good deal of supervision. The sanitary condition of the property under the railway company is properly looked after; and, beyond any doubt, if the Dublin Main Drainage scheme had been carried into effect, our drainage could have been vastly improved. It is not for a moment to be supposed that a comparatively small township could undertake such a work as the construction of an outfall canal as was proposed in the scheme of 1871. Some of the inhabitants having suggested that it would be desirable to have the sewage impounded, and the communications from the authorities to the township being to the effect that the Corporation would be able to make provision for having the township sewage taken away from it; and that they should go on with their plans so as to enable the Corporation to connect the two sewage systems. The township took the necessary steps to meet the Corporation scheme. It was then anticipated that three years would enable the Corporation to complete that scheme, but it fell through, unfortunately. The Commissioners of Kilmainham were, however, sufficiently alive to their position to go on and to have their scheme prepared, so that they would have been able to take advantage of the Corporation offer, had the Corporation scheme been carried out. The absence of that scheme leaves them in a position not so complete as they should be, but that fact is not to be laid to the charge of the Commissioners, because the idea of providing an outfall at their own expense is out of the question. The township is small, and the cost would be altogether ruinous. I will ask Mr. McNamee to give his evidence, and I will examine some other witnesses who will give you information as to the township, boundary, &c., so that you will have the case of Kilmainham fully before you, and you will be enabled to report on it as you think right.

5715. CHAIRMAN.—Could you tell us how many houses the railway company have built between 1848 and the present time?

Mr. ANDREWS, Q.C.—I will ascertain from some of the gentlemen here, who will, no doubt, be able to give it.

5716. CHAIRMAN.—It is curious that the entire valuation of the railway, in 1868, unbuilt-on land and railway, was £2,367; now the land and buildings belonging to the railway company are only valued at £3,053; so that it would appear as if there was only £685 extra valuation since 1868.

Mr. ANDREWS, Q.C.—Yes, the £2,353 includes all the township lands as well as railway.

5717. CHAIRMAN.—What was the valuation of unbuilt land belonging to the railway in 1868?

Mr. ANDREWS, Q.C.—I will endeavour to find that out for you. I have not it upon my brief.

5718. CHAIRMAN.—Here is the Dublin and Kingstown line, and they pay five-sixths on £10,000 in Pembroke, while your entire land occupied by the railway is only valued at £2514, and you only pay one-fourth on that.

Mr. ANDREWS, Q.C.—That is ten or eleven acres actually under the line.

5719. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose the entire line through Pembroke is not two miles. You have your line from Inchicore down to the station.

Mr. ANDREWS.—This is only a little bit down to

Island-bridge. We have no control over the valuation, but the proportion of the railway through the township is very small compared with the extent of railway in Penrhosk. Two or three miles of the Wicklow line run through Penrhosk, but there is only a trifles of railway in Kilmainham township.

5730. CHAIRMAN.—I thought it was a mile and a half from Inchicore to the King's-bridge?

Mr. Andrews, q.c.—Oh, no.

5731. Mr. Neale, q.c.—It is a little over a mile,

DUBLIN
May 24, 1879.
Mr. Henry E.
Beaumont.

5732. CHAIRMAN.—One runs nearly a mile, and the other about three.

Mr. Andrews, q.c.—That is about it.

5733. CHAIRMAN.—And yet the one is valued at £19,000, and the other is valued at only £914.

Mr. Andrews, q.c.—I suppose the valuation is, to some extent, dependent on the traffic returns; they make some approximation of what the rent would be; and they consider whether it is entirely suburban

DAVID McBRIDE examined.

D. McBrady.

5734. Mr. Andrews, q.c.—You are chairman of the Kilmainham township?—Yes.

5735. And you are also a justice of the peace for the city?—Yes.

5736. And you have been chairman since 1867, when the township came under the Act of 1854?—I have.

5737. After it was formed under that Act of 1854, you got your special Act in 1863?—Yes.

5738. How was your township circumstanced as regards water supply, roads, and public lighting at the time you got it incorporated?—It could not be possibly worse than it was before we got our Act.

5739. You had no proper supply except what you could derive from the canal and pumps?—None whatever.

5740. And your roads were in a neglected state?—A very bad state.

5741. And you had no public lighting at all?—No public lighting whatever.

5742. And it was the county Grand Jury who were to blame for the state of your roads?—The county Grand Jury.

5743. Under the powers of your Act you borrowed a sum of £2,850?—Yes.

5744. And you got that from the National Bank?—We did.

5745. Out of that, after paying for the cost of your Act, you provided the cost of getting water mains?—We did.

5746. That cost £1,200?—Yes.

5747. And the rate you pay for your twenty gallons per head per day is 4d. in the pound on the valuation?—Yes.

5748. And I believe you obtain your gas from the Alliance Gas Company?—Yes.

5749. Did you find, after you obtained your water supply, and began to light the township, that a marked improvement took place in the township?—A very considerable improvement took place.

5750. The area of the township is, as we know, 554 acres?—It is.

5751. The valuation in 1863 was £6,243?—Yes; quite correct.

5752. And the proportion of that upon land, and land under railway, was £2,357?—Yes.

5753. That leaves, as the valuation of building, £3,886?—Yes.

5754. Your present Poor Law valuation, as we know, is £8,911—Quite so. In round numbers £9,000.

5755. And you have in land, and land under railway, £5,431, and in buildings £5,479?—Quite so.

5756. The population in 1851 was 4,751, and in 1871 it increased to 4,965?—Yes.

5757. Your board consists of nine members?—It does.

5758. You meet once a month?—Yes.

5759. Do you transact business only, or do you go into extraneous subjects?—We transact business merely—business connected with the township, and no other.

5760. Do you allow any political discussions?—We never do that.

5761. How are the roads and avenues through the township kept?—The roads through the township are

considerably better than they were before the township was formed.

5762. Is there supervision over them?—Regular supervision over them. A good number of the Commissioners live in the township, and they exercise personal supervision independent of the surveyor.

5763. Is the scavenging and watching of the township looked after?—It is.

5764. Do you provide for your roads good materials?—For the repair of the roads we use the best materials we can get.

5765. Do you also, to the extent of your powers, attend to the sanitary arrangements?—Yes, indeed, we do.

5766. I believe the portion the railway company is interested in is not at all behind the rest of the township in sanitary arrangements?—It is not.

5767. Is that particularly well looked after?—Very well looked after.

5768. The death rate, as nearly as we can go to it, is sixteen in the 1,000?—Yes, I think so.

5769. Your habitations are only 1,000, and in a short time you expect to have that paid off?—It will vanish into thin air.

5770. Your present rate is 3s. 6d., and that includes water?—Yes, that includes water rate.

5771. And when you pay off your entire debt you of course expect to be able to reduce that rate?—Certainly.

5772. MR. COTTON.—Can you give us the rates for the last four years?—I think they are about 3s. 6d. in the pound each year.

5773. Mr. Andrews, q.c.—3s. 6d. is the rate for the last five years.

5774. CHAIRMAN.—How is it made up?

Mr. Andrews, q.c.—I will have the accounts put before you. In townships like this they are not obliged to limit, as they are in Dublin, a particular rate to a particular work. They have an estimate of what they require, and they expend on each requirement what they find necessary of the 3s. 6d., and I find their overdraft has been nominal—on the last account it was £1 4s. 6d.

5775. CHAIRMAN.—They may divide the rate as they like. I find "salaries, £111 6s.;" "road repairs and scavenging, £443 9s. 1d.;" "lighting, £36 0s. 6d.;" "water rate to the Corporation, £129 17s. 1d." (See App. No. 25.)

Mr. Andrews, q.c.—We are obliged to pay a Grand Jury rate to the extent of £263, and there are other small items.

5776. MR. McBRIDE'S examination continued.—It must be borne in mind that when we have our debt paid we expect to have the rates very considerably reduced, and it should also be borne in mind that the costs of the Act, which were very heavy, were included in the money we had to borrow. Besides that we had to pay for the water pipes and gas, and also the expenses of the Act, so that we have incurred considerable expense that will now cease to exist.

5777. CHAIRMAN.—Do you recollect, in round numbers, what the Act cost you?—I think it cost £1,500.

5778. Was it an opposed Act?—It was.

5779. MR. COTTON.—Who opposed it?—I think it was the Great Southern Railway Company, under the

DUNNIN,
May 14, 1878.
D. McBRIDE,

Impression that they would be taxed to a much heavier amount than they really were under the Bill, but since the making of the township I think they see the utility of it.

5770. CHAIRMAN.—I suppose they gave you back all the costs of the opposition?—Indeed, they did not, but we have no objection to receive it, and it will wipe out the debt.

5771. Mr. Andrews, Q.C.—They had to pay their share, and the railway company surely use the roads at all, yet they are paying the full township rate on the great bulk of their property. Having been Chairman so long, Mr. McBride, are you able to tell the Commissioners what is the feeling in the township as regards annexation?

Mr. McBride.—I think to a man they are opposed to the annexation, and we think it would be very unfair to annex us to the city, and I will give my reasons for it. There is a very strong feeling by every member in the township who has thought upon the subject, that it would be very unfair to annex us to the city, subjecting us to a much larger taxation than we will have to pay in the course of a year or two. They also feel strongly that we have carefully looked after the interests of the township, carefully looked after its resources, and carefully applied them, and of the Corporation of Dublin—I am astounding, perhaps, to the present Corporation so much as to the Corporation that existed many years ago—had looked after their business as we have done, we would not be troubled on the present occasion by their seeking to annex the township—inasmuch as the Corporation would be in a very different position now. I suppose I suffer from it through the present heavy taxation of the city. I pay a very large revenue to the Corporation, and I don't think that that burden should be extended by reason of the Corporation's misdeeds. I think they should keep within their own district, and endeavour to reform their own plans and ways.

5772. Mr. Andrews, Q.C.—From what you know of the district, do you think annexation would have a tendency to check improvements?—I am quite sure it would.

5773. Would it operate in that way as regards building?—It would, indeed. One of the inducements to people to build there is that it is not subject to Corporation taxation. Heretofore it has been a very backward neighbourhood, and it is just now beginning to recover itself, and improve. By reason of the requirements of the district they have got up embankments which have greatly improved the place. There is now a regular system from College-green to Inchicore. We have light and water, and it would be a very serious matter to the interests of that township to annex it to the Corporation.

5774. Mr. Heron.—You spent £44 last year on the roads?—Yes.

5775. How many miles of roads have you?—I don't know exactly, but I shall be able to give you that. I presume about three or four miles. There is one portion of a road for which the Corporation contribute one-half.

5776. That is the South Circular-road?—Yes.

5777. Do you know the mileage of that?—About half a mile, I think.

5778. Mr. Andrews.—And the sum you have mentioned included scavenging, repairs, &c.?—Yes.

5779. Mr. Heron.—Are there any hospitals in the township?—No, I think not. I think the Royal Hospital is in the township.

5780. The railway company are stated to have 850 persons living in their houses?—Yes.

5781. And those persons, of course, if they become ill and go to hospital must go to Dublin?—Well, I presume so. Or the railway company, perhaps, have their people attended to on the spot.

5782. Mr. Andrews.—You will find that they have admirable arrangements there in that respect.

Witness.—The township has got a sanitary doctor.

5783. Mr. Heron.—Do you pay anything yourselves to the hospitals?—I thank not. We pay as little as ever we can.

5784. Have you made a calculation of how much your taxation would be increased provided you paid it at the present Dublin rate?—We never made any calculation of that sort at all, because we raised our hands against it at once; we were frightened at it.

5785. You don't know whether it would be 1s. 6d. more or 1s. more?—I am quite sure it would be a great deal more than 1s. 6d.

5786. Is it then solely from motives of economy that you think the interests of the township would suffer?—Upon my word I think it is from motives of economy, and also from motives of expediency. We do our business better than the Corporation of the city of Dublin.

5787. Where is the township drained, and where does the outfall go to?—The township is drained as has been stated by Mr. Andrews. We are very much in want of that, but we are still looking forward anxiously for the Corporation to bring in their drainage scheme so as to take advantage of it. We are not permitted to drain into the Canoe river, which runs through the township. If we were we should have it done at once, but we are not permitted to do that.

5788. Where does the sewage go to now?—Well, I believe, some of it, caused by their recent invasion, did go into the Canoe river.

5789. And, I presume, the sewerage is now provided for by cesspools?—I think so.

5790. How many cesspools are there?—I don't know. I am only supposing that.

5791. There is no main sewer draining the township?—No, there is not.

5792. Are there any sewers along the high roads?—No, I think not. The Corporation won't allow us to drain into the sewer.

5793. Is there any single sewer in the whole of the township?—Any main sewer?

5794. Yes?—I don't think there is.

5795. CHAIRMAN.—You don't think that desirable?—I don't think it is. I think myself that that is the only thing that we are bodily in want of—that is an outfall.

5796. Because you have plenty of water for flushing if you had a sewer?—Yes, we have got water.

5797. How do the houses there now manage—what do they drain into?—Well, I think, a good deal of it is drained by reason of the railway running through the township; it has made its way through it. That is my opinion, but we have no main sewer, as a matter of fact.

5798. But they didn't make their houses drain down to the railway?—I don't think so, but I presume it.

5799. Has not your sanitary officer been able to tell you as to that, because that would be making the railway a sort of cesspool to drain the township? Have you a sanitary officer?—We have.

5800. Is that the same person as is the Town Clerk?—We have an Inspector and a sanitary officer.

5801. How much a year do you pay him?—I don't know. We have the particular as to that here.

5802. Don't you know you are bound to have a consulting sanitary officer?—Yes, and we have one.

5803. Does he attend the meetings of the Commissioners?—Indeed, then, he does not, it is not necessary. He attends whenever we summon him.

5804. Have you an executive sanitary officer and a subordinate officer?—We have.

5805. Has he ever made a report as to the state of the drainage?—No, except as to the drainage of some houses—small cottages—built by some person at Island-bridge. We had frequent complaints about those houses.

5806. And what was done about them?—I think he was summoned to the police office and ordered to take the cottages down that he built without any provision whatsoever for drainage.

5807. But with reference to the other houses—are

they lot to look after themselves!—But you see it is a rural district, and there are many rural districts that have no accommodation of that kind.

5808. Mr. Heron.—Were there any new houses built last year?—I don't think there were.

5809. On the year before?—Very few. Not many, to my knowledge.

5810. With the exception of the railway houses, have any new houses been built since the township was formed?—Yes, there were a good many.

5811. How many?—I built six myself, and the late Mr. Hasson built several.

5812. There has been no great increase of the population?—There has been an increase of the population, and a great number of houses erected since the township was formed.

5813. CHAIRMAN.—Between 1861 and 1871 the increase of the population was something about 200—224 in the ten years.

5814. Mr. Heron.—That would not represent more than twenty houses.

5815. CHAIRMAN.—And the valuation to the present time from the year 1865 has been only £3,700?

Walrus.—It has increased about 50 per cent.

5816. CHAIRMAN.—Nothing like it. You meet once a month you say. Is that necessary in your opinion, for the purpose of transacting the business fairly?—Indeed, I think it is all the better of it.

5817. How long does it take to transact the business fairly, without losing time over it?—I should say from three-quarters of an hour to an hour.

5818. Mr. Andrews.—Is it once a week or once a month you meet?—Once a month.

5819. CHAIRMAN.—What is your opinion of the Rathmines people not meeting more than once a month, and then only taking about an hour to do their business?—There are some cases in which we cannot get a quorum, and then the meeting has to be postponed.

5820. How many is the quorum?—Five under the Act.

5821. Mr. Corrigan.—Do you know whether the whole of the township of Kilmainham is under the Metropolitan Police District?

Mr. Heron.—It is.

5822. Mr. Corrigan.—There is some doubt about it, because under the Bridge Act it mentions "the portion of Kilmainham that is not within the police district," and I wanted to try and ascertain whether the whole of the township is within the police district!

5823. Mr. Parkes Newell.—I have made inquiries, and I cannot find it.

5824. Mr. Corrigan.—It is mentioned in the Act "borders Clontarf and that portion of the police district not in Kilmainham."

5825. Mr. Parkes Newell.—I am inclined to think from inquiries I made—from information I got from the police, from their own documents—that the boundaries are absolutely co-terminous.

5826. Mr. Corrigan.—Then, it is a mistake on the part of the party drawing the Act. But I thought Mr. McElroy might know about it, knowing the locality.

5827. CHAIRMAN.—Don't the people living in Kilmainham largely use the streets of Dublin?—Oh, they do, whenever they come into it, chiefly by rail.

5828. From Inchicore?—Yes.

5829. Mr. Andrews.—And by train also?—Yes.

5830. CHAIRMAN.—Is there not a very large traffic of cars from Richmond Barracks?—There is, indeed.

5831. The court-houses are in Kilmainham?—It is.

5832. The Chairman of the County, as we all know, sits there six times in the year. There is a good deal of traffic out there than from the city?—Indeed, it is very evident that there is, and people going to the court-houses avail themselves of the train. I hardly ever saw a second car up at the court-houses.

5833. Don't you think, indirectly, the railway company use the streets of Dublin very largely—that directly they bring all their passengers and deposit

them at nearly the extreme western portion of the township; whence all those people go by Westland-row to England, by the Great Northern to Belfast, and so on—here and there—and in that way use the streets of Dublin?—They do.

5834. Don't you think the railway company should contribute something towards the repair of the streets of Dublin?—Upon my word, I don't think they should.

5835. Well, now, how would you say that. Look at all the carts that stand at the Kingsbridge, and drive the passengers from that terminus to Westland-row, the Northern terminus, the Wicklow railway (Harcourt-street), and who also go to all parts of the town, such as Rathmines, Rathgar, and so on, with heavy freight from the Great Southern and Western Railway, who get the money for bringing them there. Don't they use the streets of Dublin—the passengers coming by that railway—very largely?—They do, of course.

5836. And don't the railway company get a large income from them?—I don't think they do. They get a large income for bringing the passengers to Kingsbridge, but no further. Then the carts pay the necessary taxation—the carts that are employed to bring those passengers into the different parts of Dublin, and I think that should be sufficient to recompence the Corporation.

5837. Now, suppose you had a theatre just at the very spot where the Kingsbridge terminus is. That theatre would be largely frequented by the people of Dublin, and the people from Rathmines, and the people from Dremondra, Rathgar, Pembroke, and so on, and don't you think it would be fair that the owner of that theatre should pay something?—I don't think he should be called on to pay more than the valuation of his building. I think that should not be taken into account at all, as at the very time that the late Alderman Reynolds occupied a place in this council, he was always desirous of getting a revenue from the carts from the tolls, as a means of enabling the council to provide better roads, and better accommodation, and he never could succeed in doing that. That is a thing that should be borne by the Government. The additional revenue that this Corporation seek to get now should come from some other source, irrespective of the township. That is my opinion.

5838. Suppose it was thought right to recommend that the townships of Rathmines and Parnell should be brought into Dublin, or Rathmines into Dublin, and part of Pembroke—do you think there is any reason why Kilmainham, Clontarf, and Dremondra, should not be brought in also?—I think there is a very considerable difference, because Kilmainham township has more of a rural character. You might well extend the city boundary out to three or four miles beyond Kilmainham, as to take Kilmessham township in, because it is a rural district, as you will see by the map, and its population has not increased very much since the township was formed, while if it is brought into the city, and annexed to the Corporation, there will be still less of an increase of the population.

5839. Mr. Corrigan.—What advantage has Kilmainham derived, as a matter of fact, from being made a township at all?—It has derived better roads, better lighting, better water supply—it has derived a great many advantages, indeed, I don't know any neighbourhood that has derived more.

5840. But it is said that there has been nothing done in the way of drainage?—Give us an outfall, and we will drain.

5841. But it has not been done?—Give us an outfall, that is all we want.

5842. CHAIRMAN.—You say, "Let the citizens of Dublin pay for our outfall for us, and make a drainage system, and we will drain it out, and we will pay our quota to it!"—Yes, we will pay our quota to it.

5843. Supposing there was an idea of sanctioning you to Dublin, and the Corporation paid you back £1,300

DUBLIN,
May 24, 1872.
D. McElroy.

DR. MCBEIRNEY.
May 24, 1872.
D. McBeirney.

—what it cost them to lay their mains—what would you say to that?—I am speaking in the absence of any consultation with my brother Commissioners, but I presume we would have no objection to pay a fair remuneration for the outfall.

5844. Would your suggestion be that the township of Kilmainham should pay something fair towards the drainage system for Dublin, and towards keeping up the streets of Dublin?—No; I think we should not be called upon to pay one farthing towards keeping up the streets of Dublin. I think we should pay something for main drainage, so as to be able to drain the township into it.

5845. Don't you think it of advantage to the people of Kilmainham, that they should not have dirty Dublin, but clean Dublin, to come into?—Yes; but, then you might as well tax the citizens of Dublin for the Kilmainham township.

5846. And they propose to do that?—We don't want you at all.

5847. I don't suppose they could attempt to make such a proposal to anyone having an ounce of sense, as to say that when we take our own we are not to give you an equivalent—but what they say is—We will ask you to pay on your valuation, which is only £8,000 a year. Our valuation is said to be £600,000 a year. We will ask you to pay only one-hundredth part of what we pay, and we will contribute the other mostly-minor towns keeping you up." They say, "We will give you the benefit of our city estate!"—I am afraid of that.

5848. You are shaking your head at the idea of a city estate!—I would, personally, be much more benefited financially by this association with the city. I presume it would relieve the citizens of Dublin of a considerable amount of taxation, as compared with what they now pay. But at the same time, I think it would be an act of great injustice to the township—I mean the township of Kilmainham especially, that was formed by reason of its not being in connection with the City of Dublin, or its taxation, and to take advantage of our labour, and our industry, and our economy. To bring us in now would be very unfair.

5849. Suppose they give you an equivalent?—They would do nothing of the kind.

5850. Do you know that the Legislature could make them do it?—I know this.

5851. And then you would abolish the township and come into the Corporation?—I find that they make Act of Parliament, and then, under the advice of such eminent counsel as yourself, they would run a coach and four through any one of them. I hope you will leave Kilmainham alone by itself. We are well enough as we are.

5852. Mr. Andrews.—You would not be ambitious to become a member of the Town Council as I understand?—I am not ambitious for that at all. I had the honour of a seat at one time, but I didn't care for it.

5853. CHAIRMAN.—If you were in Rathmines would you have the same views with regard to Rathmines?—I don't care to mix myself up with that. I really do think that the townships should be excepted for the present, and I will give you my reasons. Now, the Corporation of the city of Dublin in a few years will be very much more wealthy than it is now, and if this inquiry took place some ten or twenty years after the present time it might alter the state of things very much, because then the Corporation would be in a position to come and offer something like fair terms to the respective townships. At present they are not in that position according to my opinion, but the Corporation will be wealthy by-and-by.

5854. Suppose it appeared on the best calculation a man could make—from the audited accounts of the Corporation, passed by the Government Auditor, and using one's common sense, if they have any, on that—if the result of bringing, say Fenwick into Dublin be this—that you would suffer for a few years to the extent of say £s. in the pound upon that township. It

is almost a moral certainty that within five or ten years their taxation would be reduced below what they pay at present. What would your idea be then?—I think it would be time enough, to wait until the taxation would be reduced.

5855. That would be no answer for us to give in a Report to the House of Commons—to go forward to the House of Commons and say that we would suggest the desirability of postponing any consideration of this matter for the next ten or fifteen years until you saw that the Dublin Corporation was in a position to offer you reduced rates!—That is the very thing I was going to suggest to you to do.

5856. You know Cork. What do you say as regards Cork? In Cork it appears that no party objects down almost as far as Blackrock Castle, and that is four miles at least from Cork!—It is.

5857. Very well. What the people say there is, that they are using the roads and streets of Cork and sending in there for their shopping and amusements, and, therefore, they don't object to be brought into the city boundary, but what they say is that they could not pay the same taxes as are levied in the city of Cork. If that truth applies there, why should not the townships of Rathmines, Kilmainham, and so on, pay something towards the city of Dublin?—Yes, but the position of Cork may differ very widely from that of Dublin. I don't know anything about the taxation of the city, but I think it may differ very widely from the circumstances under which the townships are connected outside the Corporation.

5858. You must take it, too, that we cannot help shutting our eyes in regard to the fact that if you were now to apply to Parliament to get Drumcondra as a township there is a recommendation of the House of Commons Committee, and one on which they were unanimous, that no township should be allowed to be created within two miles of another. Bearing in mind that the Select Committee have recommended that, would that alter your view with regard to any recommendation to bring in a township only separated by a canal?—It would not alter my opinion one iota. I think both Rathmines and all the townships should be thoroughly exempt from Dublin in the present sense.

5859. Take the very last house in Fitzwilliam-place—where Mr. Watson lives. Mr. Watson has to pay all the taxes of the city. Go over the bridge to the first house in Upper Leeson-street and the man living there gets his ton of coal delivered at just the same rate, the coal having travelled over the whole city, and is doing, must, to a certain extent have dirtied it. Do you think that that man should not be made to pay £s. towards the keeping up of the streets over which his coal is carried, and the scavenging and keeping clean of those streets?—That is the only point on which, to a certain extent, the townships have any feasible claim to be rated at all.

5860. Would you think that in such a township as Rathmines, or in the Penkridge township—take Upper Bagget-street and Lower Bagget-street, and Upper Leeson-street and Lower Leeson-street—when you come to the last house in Leeson-street and the first house over the bridge one gets his coal at the same rate as the other, and not one farthing is paid by the man who sends it out towards keeping up the roads of the city, or towards cleaning them though he dirties them!—The reason that houses were built over the canal and outside the city boundary is the inducement that people had to build there. If they thought they were going to be taxed and brought under the taxation of the Corporation, they would not have built those houses. If they were brought in I would look upon it as a breach of faith with every person who has laid out money, as you say, immediately outside the boundaries of the city. It would be, in my opinion, a breach of faith to bring them in and subject them to the taxation of the Corporation.

5861. Is it not equally so in the London district? Why the Metropolitan Board of Works levy taxation I think twelve and thirteen miles down from the Bank

The people go on and build, and through their ground at present is not taxed, they know that in very moment they build it will be taxed, and they levy those taxes towards the enormous cost of the sewerage of London, and they pay the same taxes. On what principle is a man in Dublin not to do the same?—It resolves itself into what I said before. I think it is too soon. The time has not come yet for the annexation of the townships with the Corporation.

5842. But you know that the Legislature put a bridge tax upon the Metropolitan Police District of Dublin with something else added, but not distributing it over the county at large. As the bridges are dealt with in that way is not that an indication that the Legislature consider that the townships all over that district should contribute something?—It may be an indication, but the Legislature is not always right.

5843. But there it is. Do you not think that people paying £d. in the pound for keeping up the bridges, should pay something towards keeping up the approaches to those bridges?—If that argument stood good, you might as well extend it to Belfast and Cork.

5844. No, because the legislature have limited the district, and they have not said it shall be done over the county at large. Now don't you think if a person is made to pay something towards keeping up a bridge across the Liffey, that he should also pay something towards keeping up the avenue by which you arrive at that bridge?—I do not, inasmuch as the people who are called upon out at Dalkey to pay a portion of the bridge-tax have all great reason to be dissatisfied.

5845. You talk of interfering with vested rights, but the legislature interfered with your vested rights in respect of Dalkey, because they made you pay at

DALKEY the same tax on your valuation in respect of the bridges as you pay in Dublin!—Then it becomes a question of whether it is right or wrong.

5846. Mr. HERON.—With a new valuation would you consider it advantageous to unite the townships and the Corporation under one council?—I think in about twenty years it would do.

5847. Provided that at the end of the twenty years they showed themselves competent to keep up the management—I think people would then deal with them as best they could in twenty years hence.

5848. You think that ultimately there would be advantage in having one council?—I think with proper reforms and showing a clean board, and if the taxation of the respective townships would not be more than the existing townships pay at present—I think then it would be.

5849. And would you have Rathmines with only a 2s rate?—We expect to keep the rates down in Kilmainham to 2s 6d.

5850. Not if you give several—We would have them in a very short time if you gave us an outfall; that is all we want.

5851. CHAPMAN.—If you have drainage it would cost you something like £30,000 or £40,000!—Not if we get an outfall at the boundary.

5852. But the Corporation are not bound to give you an outfall at the boundary?—Perhaps not.

5853. Mr. ANDREWS.—The provision by which they got the Act of 1871 was, that the Corporation could give an outfall to the township.

5854. Mr. HERON.—If the township contributed.

Witness.—Yes.

DESIGN.
May 31, 1873
D. McHENRY.

MR. FRANCIS MOORE SCOTT EXAMINED.

Mr. Francis
Moore Scott.

5855. Mr. ANDREWS.—You are a Justice of the Peace for the county of Dublin?—I am.

5856. And you are one of the township Commissioners of Kilmainham?—I am not at present; I was.

5857. I believe you are a member of the firm of Scott and Strickland, who have large works at Islandbridge, and that you are also a member of the firm of Scott, Spain, and Rooney of Merchants'-Quay, Dublin?—Yes; I am managing director.

5858. What is theatable annual valuation of your concerns in the township?—£175 I think.

5859. Are you well acquainted with Kilmainham township?—Thoroughly. I have lived there almost all my life.

5860. You knew it in 1867 and you also know it at the present time?—Yes, intimately.

5861. Since 1867 and 1868 has the township improved materially?—It has distinctly and very materially.

5862. And do you attribute that to the fact of its having a constitution of its own?—I do.

5863. Were you yourself one of the gentlemen who promoted the Township Act?—I think I may almost say I originated it. I certainly was one of the originators.

5864. And I suppose it has not disappointed your anticipations?—No, it has not; it has done better than I could have hoped it would have done, being so remote a district.

5865. You retired from the Board after matters had been set in smooth working order?—I retired in 1863 when I was in bed health, and I may add that the Commissioners and taxpayers have asked me to return to the Board, but I have not had the leisure to do so.

5866. Since you ceased to be a Commissioner have you been attending to the duty of auditing the accounts?—I have been annually elected to that post by the ratapayers.

5867. Are the rates properly collected?—I think they are very well collected—very efficiently.

5868. And from the knowledge you have—seeing the accounts from year to year—are they properly ad-

ministered?—They are, as far as I am able to judge. They are administered economically and very efficiently.

5869. Has the management of the Commissioners, as far as you have been able to judge—produced confidence in the rate-payers?—I think that is best evidenced by the fact that they rarely change them. I don't know that they have ever changed them except on re-election.

5870. Your debt has been diminished by £500, and that, I may say, has been cleared off!—The debt incurred with the National Bank has been diminished to £500, and, as far as I can judge from my acquaintance with the accounts, two years hence it will be extinguished, if not sooner.

5871. From your experience of the roads, how are the thoroughfares of the township kept?—They are kept in marked contrast to the city approaches to the township. I consider that the township roads and pathways are kept in a very fair condition, and I can only describe the approaches, which are under the direct and entire control of the city, as being indescribable in their state.

5872. Mr. CORRUX.—How is the road kept—that is the boundary between the township and the city?—That was one of the roads I alluded to. That is kept, as far as I know, now by the Town Commissioners who have a contribution from the Corporation equivalent to their portion. When I was a Commissioner, when that road was taken up, it was longitudinally divided between the city of Dublin and the Commissioners of Kilmainham. We found, of course, that keeping a road longitudinally in halves was an absurdity—an absurdity that the Corporation are at present perpetrating on the Connolly-road. But this road we found could be and should be divided into sections of halves, each half being kept by either party. We found that that didn't work, as the Commissioners kept our half in the required way—our half being from St. John's Railway Bridge to the gate, and the Corporation practically did nothing to their half. I then urged upon the Commissioners that they should induce

DUBLIN,
Aug 15, 1874.
Mr. Francis
Moore Scott.

the Corporation to pay the annual quota to us and give us charge of the entire road—their half as well as ours. That was done during my chairmanship, and I think that arrangement continues to the present time.

5893. Mr. Andrews.—I believe a large portion of the township rates are expended upon the road repairs!—Yes, very large. Almost altogether that had the extinguishing of the debt have been almost one sole expenditure. We have scarcely any salaries.

5894. Will you kindly give the Commissioners your view as to the advantage or disadvantage of Kilmainham being annexed to Dublin?—I cannot help being myself convinced that it would be the ruin of the district. I don't like to use any less strong word than ruin.

5895. Well, practically, have the Corporation anything to offer that would be an inducement to come in?—They have nothing to offer, and we have everything to lose. We would lapse into that state of benighted neglect from which we emerged some twelve years ago.

5896. Do you agree with Mr. McEnery that the feeling of the township is almost unanimous against annexation?—I believe it is a unanimous feeling that way. I would like to correct what I have read respecting one or two statements made in the course of the present inquiry. I read the evidence of Mr. Byrne, and I cannot understand how he could take upon himself to give evidence on the subject when he displayed such a lack of information. He stated some matters which are not matters of fact, within my own knowledge. For instance, he quoted the fact that we embraced the two large barracks in our area. That is not so. Islandbridge Barracks—it was most distinctly stated here by Mr. Byrne that those barracks were in the Kilmainham township.

5897. Mr. Corcoran.—That was corrected at the time?—I didn't read the correction; but it never was in the township. The other point in his statement that I wish to refer to is that in which he said that our township was very much built upon—that there was scarcely any agricultural or arable land in the district. That is not so. The statistics which Mr. Andrews read prove that—that it is nearly entirely an agricultural district.

5898. CHAIRMAN.—It is a salient thing how you ever got your Act, because it is a fixed rule not to give a township to a rural district!—I think we got the Act because there were two or three populous villages scattered around in the township, and to these villages we supply two of—I may call them the necessities of life—light and water.

5899. Do you know anything as to the sanitary condition of the township?—I am honorary secretary of the Palmerstown Dispensary Committee, and I hear and do a good deal as to the sanitary state of the township.

5900. How are the houses drained?—There is no system of drainage.

5901. Is there not a good deal of drainage into the Camis river?—That is the only channel, because it runs lower than a considerable portion of the township.

5902. What I mean is—are there no constructed drains, and are the drains allowed to run into that river now?—I cannot tell you.

5903. Have you a map of the township showing the several of the township and by what the drainage goes?—I cannot tell you that.

5904. As long as you were a member of the Board do you remember ever having seen a map of that sort?—I never remember seeing a map showing the drains into each of the houses. As I told you, there are no drains—no main drains. There are cesspools built where the new houses are constructed.

5905. Does anyone look after them?—They have sanitary officers, and I have seen summonses—and have personal knowledge of the fact—for breaches of the law in that respect. I have myself made com-

plaints, and I have seen that the matters of which I complained were remedied.

5906. Mr. Brown.—In the water always kept running?—The Varty water is, as far as I am aware, always kept on. I have never heard that it was not, except at intervals for repair.

5907. CHAIRMAN.—How would those matters of complaint, and the summonses, come before you for adjudication?—They have not come before me for adjudication, but to my knowledge they have occurred. It would be in the metropolitan police district. I believe the bounds of the metropolitan police district and the bounds of the township are co-extensive, as far as I know.

5908. You said that the township had largely increased. I find that the valuation in 1868 was £3,345, and notwithstanding all that the Great Southern and Western Railway have done—the valuable houses they have built, and then works at Inchicore, the valuation has only gone up to £5,911 in eleven years!—I don't think I said it had greatly increased. I think I spoke of the allegation that it had increased, and contesting it.

5909. How many new houses have been built in the township during the last ten years?—There have been a good many, but I could not count them. There have been a reasonable number of new houses built.

5910. You said, as one of your reasons why you would not go into the Corporation, that if you did you would be brought back into your former state of benighted neglect—I think those were the words you used?—Yes, I said so.

5911. You have obtained the Varty water from the Corporation, and that was a great improvement, but what have you done yourselves?—We have done a good deal to improve the maintenance of the roads in Kilmainham. All our roads are fairly kept, but on approaching the township from the city we have to go a circuitous route through the Park, through which heavy traffic will not be allowed. When I have my horses working on that road I am at a loss to know how they will ever get into Dublin, the approaches are so bad. One of the roads I refer to is the Conyngham-road, and the other is the St. John's-road, and they are both wholly in the charge of the Corporation of Dublin.

5912. The Conyngham-road is in a frightful state!—Yes, so much so that I have directed that my horses are not to travel over it.

5913. Dr. Forwood.—The County of Dublin have control over it, and they have refused for twenty years to make a presentation fit!—My knowledge that road was always maintained by the Corporation of Dublin, until a very recent time. I am speaking now of matters that have come within my own personal observation within the last three years. They discovered that they had been doing it wrongfully, and I think they succeeded recently in getting a presentation passed at the Castlereagh Presentation Sessions, for a sum sufficient to maintain one-half of that road, and I trust that the city authorities will see their way to giving it into one hand, or to taking it into their own hand, and collecting the money.

5914. If there is any report in favour of an extension of the boundary, it could be easily done by taking it across the borough!—I should be very glad if the management of the road was placed in one competent charge.

5915. Mr. Breeridge.—It was only at Easter term this year that the county for the first time agreed to give anything for the repair of that road. For twenty years the Corporation made every effort to try and get the county or the Board of Works to light the side adjoining the Park. It has always been a disputed matter, and the city put some metal on it, but as soon as our accounts were audited we found we could not keep it in repair out of the rates.

5916. CHAIRMAN.—It would be better that it should cross into the city.

5917. You left the Commissioners in 1872?—Yes;

I mention that road as being an approach to the township because the Commissioners have nothing to do with that road.

5919. For your works you have to draw large supplies through the city!—We draw coal and various materials.

5920. To what extent!—I never calculated that.

5920. It must be large!—Yes, it must.

5921. Do you think that for drawing your coals and other materials through the town that you should not pay something towards the roads of the city!—I do

not. I can see no justice, or fairness, or principle, upon which it could be urged that commissioners itself to do so.

5922. We have, at all events, the Legislature asserting the principle in connexion with the bridge tax!—Which I look upon as most unfair, because the bridge tax extends to Ballybrack, and stops just behind my house. It comes to the Cross-road at Ballybrack, and I know it well, because my father's place happens to be at the corner of the road. I happen to know the locality very well.

DUBLIN
May 24, 1882
Mr. Justice
Harris Scott.

Mr. John Summers.

5923. Mr. Andrews—You own the Hibernian Mills, and have a large establishment at Kilmessingham!—I do.

5924. And you are a ratepayer in the annual sum of £333!—Yes.

5925. And I believe, Mr. Summers, you have also very considerable property in the City of Dublin!—Yes, about the same valuation.

5926. So that you are able to look upon the question at all events dispassionately!—Yes; the property I have includes a good deal of house property as well as the mills.

5927. I believe you were one of the original promoters of the township!—Yes.

5928. And after its incorporation as a township you were one of its first Commissioners!—I was.

5929. But you are not a Commissioner now!—No; I resigned some years ago.

5930. How has that incorporation scheme worked for the benefit of the township!—I think it has worked exceedingly well.

5931. From your observation, while a Commissioner, and also since the time you have ceased to be a Commissioner, did the Board discharge its duties with propriety and faithfulness towards its trust!—I think they have exceeded well, and considerable improvements have been obtained.

5932. Do you regard the taxation as moderate!—I do.

5933. What would be the effect of the annexation of the township to the city!—I think it would be very injurious, and I think it would prevent building going on in the neighbourhood.

5934. How are the roads and footways kept!—In very good order.

5935. Do you think they would be as well kept if united to the city!—I cannot say; they are much better than when kept under the Grand Jury.

5936. As regards the sanitary matters, are they attended to as well as the local circumstances admit of?—There is no drainage. There are no main drains in the township. There was a scheme proposed some years ago for draining the township, but it was stopped for the want of an outfall, which the Corporation was to give the township if the main drainage system had been carried out in the city. If the main drainage system had been carried out, the township would have been obliged to drain into the city system as soon as they got an outfall.

5937. That was part of the scheme which was sanctioned by the Legislature of 1871!—Yes; at present there are two drains, one coming from the direction of Goldenbridge Cemetery and the Richmond Barracks, into the Canoe river at Goldenbridge; and there is another drain coming away down from the bridge at Richmond, into the Canoe river, at the corner of my premises; and there is a large portion of the drainage comes into my pond and mill-runs, which is carried off as the water runs away.

5938. With the exception of the want of drainage, which the Commissioners are not responsible for, are the sanitary arrangements good, as evidenced by the health of the district!—Yes; the township is healthy.

5939. Have the township considered a system of drainage if anything like that proposed in 1871 were

carried out, and for which you would be ready to unite!—Yes; it would cost £5,000 or £3,000.

5940. Which, of course, the township would be glad to contribute if they get the advantage!—Yes.

5941. CHAIRMAN.—You would have not only to pay that £3,000 or £3,000, but you would have to pay a certain tax for the general drainage of the city!—Well, suppose we paid 4d. in the pound, that would not be a great deal.

5942. But you are paying up to 3s. 6d. at present!—But that will be reduced within the next eighteen months.

5943. How do you propose to do that, and get rid of the £300 debt, when you are up to the maximum of taxation, and have been so for several years!—The roads seem to have been very heavy last year—much heavier than usual.

5944. Perhaps you would look at this item in these accounts—the general annual accounts for the township, ending the 31st of December, 1878 (See Appendix No. 23)—and give an explanation of it. You see there "over from the last audit—deducted from the last audit, £367." Is that a payment to the bank off of the debt!—Yes.

5945. But if it is, it leaves £500 due!—Yes.

5946. Mr. Andrews.—But that will be paid off in less than two years. In that account we have been able to levy a 4d. 6d. rate, and pay so large an instalment of the bank debt!—There has been £2,300 paid off the original loan at so much a year.

5947. In the year before we paid off £500, so that we very materially reduced our rates in a couple of years!—I have not audited these accounts myself. I did some years ago, but not for the last three or four years. If you take so many years since the loan was contracted, and divide it into twenty-three, it will give you the rate of which it has been paid off.

5948. CHAIRMAN.—The Grand Jury rate for 1878 was £203 11s. 1d., while the Grand Jury rate in December, 1877, was only £195 7s. 9d.!—It is likely that the payment was not made in the former year in time, or something of that sort, and that the two payments came in on the last year. If it was only omitted for two or three days, when the accounts closed it would go into the second year. At the time the township was formed it was in a frightful state as regarded water, and I brought a sample of the water from the Curran river for analysis, and it was pronounced to be worse than the water at London bridge at its worst time.

5949. And is it on account of the taxation that you would be afraid to be put in connexion with the city!—I would not like to have my taxes raised £50 or £60 a year, or even £40 or £50.

5950. What is your valuation!—£232 in the township.

5951. When you say £50 or £60, that would represent 3s. 6d. in the pound!—If we were at all annexed to the city it would about represent that. The gross taxation of the city at present is something like 3s. 6d.

5952. But you have to pay poor rate!—Yes, 2s., and police tax, 8d., and the bridge tax.

5953. As compared with the taxes of the city, there is only a difference of 2s. 6d. When you say you would not like to have your taxes increased £50 or

DUBLIN.
May 25, 1877.
Mr. John
Summers.

£60, that would be an increase of something like 4s. in the pound. They say at present that they would not ask Pembroke to pay more than 2s., and in a few years it will be less. Put your connexion with the city out of the case, and suppose that you, as resident of Kilmainham, were fairly satisfied that your taxation would not be increased to the extent you suppose, but that, on the contrary, it would be increased not more than 1s. or 1s. 6d. in the pound for a few years, what would you say then?—What guarantee have I that it would only be increased to that extent?

5954. The only guarantee I see is this—that you have a city estate that is increasing in value, and that has increased from £600,000 to £900,000. The township would have the value of that in a proper ratio, and I feel pretty confident that if that was the case you would not have the rates of Dublin so high as they now are!—They are pretty sharp in regard to their valuations. I put two frosts in my shop in Merchant-street, and they clapped immediately £10 or £15 on the valuation of those two houses, which were only new fronted.

5955. Supposing that there was a new valuation—and that Dublin was valued fairly—that would amount to over £800,000 or £900,000. The townships of Rathmines and Pembroke would have a valuation of about £300,000; then Dublin would have to pay three-fourths of their rate, and they would only have to pay one-fourth of the Dublin rate; and then if they were all put in the same body, and then the Corporation say, in addition to that we give you the benefit of our estate, which estate will pass on the 1st of May, 1881, does on £27,000 a year. Would that alter your idea?—I don't think it would, because the Corporation have as much work as they can attend to already. That is my opinion.

5956. Have you considered this—the number of the Corporation is sixty-four. There is no town in England or Scotland that has more than that number in its Corporation, where there would be three times the area and must necessarily be manifold work to do. No town in England has a larger Corporation than sixty-four, and with ever so many more work to do—so Mr. Pim said. If the Corporation had that number of business men—sixty-four would be an ample number to do the work!—I don't know, I have had a good deal to do with committees in one way or the other from time to time, and also with large quorums, and I have invariably found that a Committee with a small quorum always got through their business best, so that the largeness of the number of the Corporation would not apply in that case.

5957. Mr. M'Elroy said that their quorum was too large. Supposing the quorum was reduced in those Committees to four or five, then representation would then be in this way—the Dublin Corporation would say, "We propose to reduce our body to forty-five or perhaps to forty, and giving a representation to the townships of twenty members and leaving the representation at sixty, and having a proper quorum." Now supposing the Corporation is not innocent and that it is not a humbug about the city estate, would not that make a difference in your views?—It would not. I have to drive to town very early in the morning, and the road I have to travel is really in a dreadful condition. From the top of Steeves's-lane to the Court-house at Kilmainham, during the greater part of last winter, it was really as much as a man's life was worth to drive along there. If the Corporation give some evidence of being able to manage their own business better than they have as yet, then they might undertake to manage the business of the townships.

Mr. Robert
Barnard.

MR. ROBERT BARNARD EXAMINED.

5958. Mr. Andrew.—You are a resident and owner of property in the township of Kilmainham, are you not?—I am.

5959. I believe your ratable value is £104 a year?—Yes.

5960. Are you a Commissioner?—I am.

5961. And you are acquainted with the township for many years?—Yes, I was born and reared in the township.

5962. Will you give the Commissioners the benefit of your views as regards annexation?—I think it would if carried out be a measure of a very injurious character to the township, first, in the very serious view of the pocket, the increase of the township tax from 3s. 6d. to the purely city rates of 4s. 6d., as in the Corporation—by that our rates in the township would be increased 33 per cent. We have another rate—that is on land, the unbuilt-on portions—which is only 10*s.d.*, that would make 2s. 9*d.* in the pound in the town, which is a very serious thing. I cannot see how annexation would give us an equivalent in any shape.

5963. Mr. Cotton.—That is, if there was any increase of taxation?—Yes.

5964. Mr. Andrew.—There is a large quantity of land in Kilmainham, that is agricultural land?—Yes, a good portion.

5965. And a great deal is not very suitable for building?—Well, there is.

5966. On the subject of taxes, I wish to know, do you conceive that there is a fair contribution from Richmond Barracks at present?—Not at all. The valuation we get from that is £100 a year, and the valuation is £400. There is generally in the barracks, with soldiers and married women, about 1,600 people. They use our roads very considerably. The people supply all their wants from the city, and the draymen and waggoners are continually trotting up and down.

5967. Do they derive their supplies from Dublin?—In the shape of coals they do, and all their bread is

carried from Aldborough House Barracks across our roads to the Richmond Barracks.

5968. If they contributed more adequately to your rates it would give you relief in that respect?—It would.

5969. What do you think their valuation should be?—I think it should be £2,000.

5970. An increase of how much?—£2,000.

5971. On this question of the use of the roads—do the traders of Dublin use your roads?—They do.

5972. To a large extent?—They do; anyone in business—take a family grocer for instance—he always buys from the wholesale merchant in town, and has his goods delivered from town by that merchant.

5973. Is the forage supplied to Richmond barracks from Dublin?—From the Smithfield market over our roads.

5974. Can you say whether the township inhabitants use the streets of Dublin more than the citizens of Dublin use your roads?—I think the citizens use our roads and paths more than we do theirs—that is of the township proper. For instance to reach the surrounding villages of Clondalkin, Red Cow, Chapelizod and so on, they must cross our main roads.

5975. Is there any point of view from which you could see that annexation would serve you?—I think two points to the contrary would very seriously arise, and I would give you the opinion of a great number of other ratepayers, and it is this—we would surely get an increase of taxation, and we would never get a chance of a decrease of taxation.

5976. Mr. Heron.—Where is the bread supplied to Richmond barracks baked?—I think at Aldborough House barracks.

5977. Then it comes across the whole of Dublin?—Yes.

5978. And the forage comes from Smithfield?—Yes, they don't use much forage, only straw for the bedding.

5979. And all the supplies for Richmond barracks come from Dublin?—Yes, I think so.

DUBLIN.

May 21, 1878.

Mr. Robert

Barrett

5980. For over 1,800 people!—Yes.

5981. And of course they use the Dublin roads!—
They do.

5982. And Richmond barracks, you say, ought to be valued at £2,000 a year!—It should, in my opinion.

5983. Did you ever apply for a revaluation?—Well, we were discussing the matter, and we did apply to the authorities on the subject, and they gave us this gratuity of £100 a year.

5984. Formerly was there any contribution?—No.

5985. They are not bound to pay it!—It is very unfair to put an institution of the kind in the midst of a neighbourhood or township that belongs to the Empire, and make the people of that neighbourhood support the roads. Why, one of the commanding officers of a regiment stationed there, Colonel Collingwood, of the 31st, wrote a letter on one occasion to the Commissioners, and the tone of it was the same as he would adopt in giving orders to his battalion, in telling us to have the roads watered, and so on, for a particular occasion. I felt very much inclined to ask the Colonel whether he paid any rates to the township, as he wanted so much done.

5986. CHAIRMAN.—The barracks were there before the township was formed!—The barracks are there since 1802.

5987. Do you think that the township should pay anything whatever towards the maintenance of the city of Dublin?—I don't see how they should.

5988. Don't they draw all their supplies from the city?—Yes.

5989. They get their coal from the city!—Yes. The more people that go into the city the better for Dublin. What would become of the city if people of the country people didn't go in and deal with them! They should be very happy to give them better roads.

5990. Are you satisfied with the sanitary condition of Kilmainham?—I am; it is very fair with the resources we have.

5991. But don't you think if you were in Dublin, it would be a great deal better—would you pay say increase of taxation for better?—The only thing they could do for us in Dublin would be to give us an outfit for the drainage. That they have not done.

REV. THOMAS MILLS EXAMINED.

REV. T. MILLS.

5992. Mr. Andrews Q.C.—I believe you are rector of St. Jude's, in Kilmainham!—Yes.

5993. Have you been a great many years there?—
Yes.

5994. Did you build a house there yourself?—I did.

5995. Have you, during the many years you have been there, had an opportunity of studying the wants and wishes of the neighbourhood?—Well, indeed, yes; I have heard of them and know them pretty well.

5996. You visit about a good deal!—I do.

5997. And are a resident there?—Yes, for the most part.

5998. Would you let the Commissioners know your views—whether they are favourable or adverse to the proposed annexation?—My opinion is not worth much, but everyone I hear speaking of the subject says that it would destroy us altogether—it would destroy any hope we have.

5999. Have you formed any reasons?—Yes; I should be sorry, indeed, to think the Corporation were managing our affairs in Kilmainham.

6000. Do you think you would have an improved or a worse state of things?—I am sure it would reverse all the improvements that have been made by the Commissioners.

6001. From the opportunities you have had going about among the people, can you say in their health good?—I never knew a more healthy district in my experience—there is no more healthy place about Dublin; but, indeed, that is owing more to nature, for we are at that side of Dublin where the wind blows from the west nine months in the year!—

6002. Mr. Baron.—Oh, no.

6003. Rev. Mr. Mills.—Well, I understand it is so; at all events, we are in a peculiarly healthy district. As to the state of the streets in the city, the other day I happened to be in Middle Abbey-street, and a gentleman stopped with me and we were looking with amazement and wonder at that street, with clover inches of mud on it, and we would be very sorry to have our roads at Kilmainham in the same condition. Another thing is this, Kilmainham township is immediately under the direction of very intelligent gentlemen who attend to the wants and requirements of the neighbourhood. In the Corporation here, I am afraid the gentlemen are returned as members of the Council for other reasons besides their business qualities.

6004. CHAIRMAN.—Are you satisfied with the sanitary arrangements there?—Well, if we had an outfit, which, being at the west of the city, is very difficult, we would be better.

6005. At the same time has anything been done to improve the drainage from the houses?—Yes, Mr.

M'Elroy's houses are drained into cesspools, and the Corporation being a very difficult body to move, we are waiting patiently for the main drainage scheme. If we had that we would be perfect.

6006. If you were satisfied that after two or three years your taxation would be increased, what then would be your view as to annexation?—I would be sorry to think for a moment of annexation, for I am afraid, from the unfortunate state of society in Ireland, that persons are elected to the Corporation for some political matter, or something of the kind, and that they are always discussing matters of politics.

6007. Dr. Norwood.—Is it your opinion that they are always discussing politics?—They have certainly that reputation, that if there is a question of freedom of education, or political prisoners, instead of freedom from dirt or dust, there is more interest shown in it by the members than in anything else.

6008. Is it your opinion that the Corporation do nothing but discuss politics and political affairs?—That is not my opinion at all, but I seldom take up a paper and see a report of the business of the Corporation, but I see at the head of it that the Lord Mayor called the roll and found there was not a quorum; I know that is often so—that and politics.

6009. How often would you say that occurred in the year?—Well, I did not exactly make any record of it, but it is my general experience.

6010. How often would you say they discuss politics during the year?—That also I don't know, but it is certainly their usual reputation of being a political rather than a business Corporation.

6011. Do you know how many meetings were held last year for the purpose of discussing political matters?—No.

6012. Would you be surprised to hear that there were eighty-six meetings at which nothing but business was discussed?—I am, exceedingly.

6013. Do you believe it?—Well, I suppose I must believe it, as it is so stated. A few gentlemen in Committee may do the business, but what comes before the public is what I am speaking of.

6014. Do you believe that in 1878 there were eighty-six Council meetings at which not a single political subject was mentioned?—Well, I would believe it if you told it to me.

6015. Dr. Norwood.—I am speaking from the records of the Corporation.

Rev. Mr. Mills.—And I am speaking of the general regulations.

6016. Dr. Norwood.—Common reputation is, they say, a common liar. Now, would you be surprised to learn that in addition to these eighty-six Council meet-

DUBLIN.
May 24, 1879.
Rev. T. Mills.

ings, at which I can assure you it will be proved no question of politics was mooted or discussed, there were 683 Committee meetings at which no politics and nothing but business was discussed!—I am very glad to hear it. If that was not the case the Corporation would not be able to do anything at all.

6017. Would you be surprised to learn that from 1873 to the present hour there have been years in which no political meeting was held at all!—I am not able to say.

6018. CHAIRMAN.—You would get citizens of Dublin very much surprised to know about the city estate; I now entertain no doubt that it is there, but I had no idea that it was there until the unmistakable and emphatic proof of it was given before us. Now, Dr. Norwood states as a fact that these meetings were held as he describes.

6019. Dr. Norwood.—Yes, perhaps, Mr. Commissioner, you had no idea that there was a year during which there was no political discussion whatever.

6020. CHAIRMAN.—I had not, and as to the question of its being looked upon as a political body, to a certain extent, you may take it as granted that a very large proportion of the citizens have that idea.—That notion underlies their whole proceedings.

6021. Dr. Norwood.—I want to show you, as a reasonable man, it is unfounded!—I hear you say so.

6022. Suppose I put in your hands the return!—I do not mean to say that the Corporation never assemble without these political proceedings, but it underlies their whole action.

6023. CHAIRMAN.—Could you give us a return or a copy showing the elections that have taken place for the past five years for the offices of Town Councillors and Aldermen, with the addresses of the candidates?

6024. Dr. Norwood.—Yes.

6025. Rev. Mr. Mills.—As it strikes me whenever I see or read a report of their proceedings or hear of them, they are divided into so many persons—Liberal and Conservative. What has Liberalism or Conservatism to do with the Corporation business? I am at a loss to imagine.

6026. Dr. Norwood.—I am not asking your opinion. It has been broadly asserted that the Corporation discusses politics instead of the city business.

Rev. Mr. Mills.—I stated that they were more interested or famed for politics than business transactions.

6027. Dr. Norwood.—During the last six years how many political meetings were held!—I have no record of statistics on the point.

6028. The CHAIRMAN.—What do you call political meetings?

6029. Dr. Norwood.—Meetings at which politics were discussed.

6030. CHAIRMAN.—It may fairly be asked why should a Corporation, which is constituted for the management of municipal affairs, discuss political matters at all. In England, as I believe, such a thing would not be listened to at all.

6031. Dr. Norwood.—As a matter of evidence, I want to show that the statement that the Corporation meets seldom, or even frequently, to discuss political affairs is inaccurate, to say the least.

6032. CHAIRMAN.—Very good, but if you go into that you cannot blame others for saying—take the addresses of the gentlemen who have come forward seeking election as Town Councillors, and see if they are not addresses more like what candidates for Parliamentary representation put forward than what might be expected from persons anxious to join a body who ought to have municipal affairs entirely at heart.

Mr. ROBERT GEORGE COLMANS examined.

Mr. Robert
G. Colmans.

6033. Mr. Andrews, q.d.—You are Assistant Goods Manager of the Great Southern and Western Railway?—Yes.

6034. I want from you a few particulars. Your North Wall extension extends from King'sbridge to the North Wall!—Yes.

6035. It has communication with the North of Ireland!—Yes.

6036. That is by the Great Northern line!—Yes.

6037. And with the West by the Midland!—Yes.

6038. And to England by communication with and from the North Wall!—Yes.

6039. Now, prior to the construction of that line, uniting King'sbridge and the North Wall, was there a large and extensive traffic through the streets, which you carry over your line now!—Yes.

6040. And you have also relieved them of goods traffic and cattle traffic as well!—Yes.

6041. Have you also constructed a station, or is a station in progress—a commodious station—near the cattle market!—It is completed.

6042. Will you give the Commissioners some idea of the traffic in 1878, and give me the number of tons you carried over that line that otherwise would have gone over the city of Dublin?—Fuller details you can furnish the Commissioners with. Take it with England first—what would have gone over the city, or road for England, in 1878!—31,500 tons.

6043. What sort of goods!—General goods, and a large quantity of butter.

6044. Now give the traffic with the North of Ireland for that year that would have gone over the city streets!—11,000 tons.

6045. And traffic with the North Wall, Spencer Dock, and that neighbourhood!—11,000.

6046. That is 43,000 tons carried in 1878 that otherwise would have gone over the streets!—Yes.

6047. Give the number of cattle that would have gone through the streets in 1878!—80,000 oxen.

6048. And am I right in saying 3,500 calves!—Yes.

6049. And 108,000 sheep!—Yes.

6050. And 23,000 pigs!—Yes.

6051. Altogether 314,500 head!—Yes.

6052. Now, if you had not this extension would all this traffic have found its way through the city somehow!—Yes.

6053. You are to have a new terminus and depot at the North Wall!—Yes; it is in progress of construction.

6054. When that is completed I presume you will be able to take even more traffic off the streets!—Yes.

6055. As against the 43,000 you mentioned already, have you been able to calculate what you will carry when these arrangements are complete!—Yes, there will be 118,000 tons.

6056. That is considerably upwards of 100,000 more than at present!—Yes.

6057. That will be, as I understand, what the streets of Dublin will be relieved of!—Entirely.

6058. I need scarcely ask you whether the means of carrying out these works will involve a very large expenditure!—Very large. Indeed, it is a most expensive piece of work.

6059. Mr. Corrigan.—What will that additional 100,000 tons consist of!—Of general goods.

6060. There will be 158,000 tons in addition to the 43,000!—No.

6061. Mr. Andrews.—The 43,000, as I take it, are included in the 158,000!—Yes.

6062. Can you give the details!—Well, the English traffic in general goods, 18,000—butter alone, 16,000 tons—this is the actual traffic, a large portion of which is carried already.

6063. Take Ireland—the amount of general goods!—2,000 tons.

6064. And Guinness' traffic alone!—Guinness' traffic alone, 12,000.

6065. There is then the traffic to Inchicore and the

North Wall 5,000 tons to Inchicore; North Wall (Great Southern and Western), 143,000.

6066. And the total of that is 158,000 tons!—Yes.

6067. Of which the streets will be relieved!—Yes.

6068. Now, as to Guinness's trade, what is their position?—In addition to that is there not a tram line or road from the King's-bridge in connexion with their stores?—Yes; there is one running along the military road, leaving the Great Southern and Western terminus, a short distance above the departure platform.

6069. Mr. Horne.—What do you charge per ton from King's-bridge to the North Wall?—For what class of traffic?

6070. I ask generally!—Well, take coal, 1s. 4d. a ton.

6071. From the North Wall to King's-bridge, take grain!—1s. 4d. a ton.

6072. And ordinary groceries and shipping goods?—2s. 6d. a ton.

6073. I suppose these are remunerative charges?—Yes, fairly; but out of this, bear in mind, we have to pay large tolls for the use of the line. We pay tolls, in some cases, to the extent of 4d. a ton to the Midland Great Western for passing over their Liffey branch, and an equal sum to the other line.

6074. All the traffic receipts for tonnage go to the railway!—Yes, all.

6075. You don't think that the city of Dublin should pay you for relieving their streets of this traffic. Would you go that far?—No; I don't think we ought to relieve their streets, and at the same time pay them.

6076. But you say that the city is to be hereafter relieved of 158,000 tons!—Yes.

6077. Is this enormous trade, in a certain sense, stopped at present?—No; there are 100,000 tons passing over the streets at present; but when the new station is constructed and completed, we will relieve it of that.

6078. Does brother now go in that 100,000?—To a small extent; the principal thing is coal, grain, and heavy goods.

6079. How far do you bring coal?—From Dublin?

6080. Yes!—As far down as the North Riding of Tipperary, Naas, and that district.

6081. And brother!—That comes from Cork and Tipperary, and is carted to the North Wall.

6082. Were you examined at the inquiries as to the value of property at the North Wall?—No.

6083. Now you say there are 100,000 tons at present going through the city—why don't you carry that? Because our station is not finished at the North Wall, and our arrangements for taking the traffic are not complete.

6084. Is that immense amount of goods all goods that will go by the London and North-Western Steamers?—No; we carry all the London and North-Western traffic at present, because their station is perfect, and the additional traffic we hope to take off the streets is our own, and that now being carted over the streets for the Liverpool route. We don't work all the Liverpool traffic over the extension.

6085. Why do you say that this small line is difficult to work?—Because of the heavy gradients, and that the engine can only take small quantities; and the line is extremely expensive as regards construction. Our trains from the North Wall are limited to twenty wagon loads, and it is not uncommon for a train to take forty-five on the main line. That speaks for itself.

6086. CHAIRMAN.—At present how many tons of goods enter your goods stores at King's-bridge every day could you tell?—Well, roughly, about 1,000 tons a day.

6087. How much of that comes from the south side of the Liffey?—I could not answer the question.

6088. What I have always understood in Dublin, and

from seeing the shipping, am I not right in saying that all the men discharge their supply of coal from the south side of the Liffey?—Yes, mostly.

6089. And is it your idea that coal to Tippemerry will be carted across to your junction at the north side of the Liffey and sent over your line?—No; but that with the accommodation we will be able to induce vessels to berth alongside our station.

6090. Have you considered whether the harbourmaster will allow you to do it?—They are berthing at present.

6091. Yes, but we know that these coal vessels discharge on the south side, and that the south side is kept for them, whilst the need is for steamers and other classes of sailing ships. How many tons of coal does your railway take at present, which is daily brought by carts to King's-bridge?—About 600 tons a week of coal.

6092. That is by carts brought inside your terminus at King's-bridge?—Yes.

6093. Now is that all from the south side of the Liffey?—No, it is not.

6094. Which then?—Part of it is from the north side of the river.

6095. How much of it?—A good deal.

6096. How many tons of coal are brought by carts from the north side to King's-bridge every day, or by the week?—I can't answer that question. All that is loaded in our wagons at Spencer Dock I should say is from the north side of the Liffey.

6097. If you charge 1s. 4d. a ton from your terminus at the North Wall up to King's-bridge, you can hardly imagine that a man who was sending his coal to the country would pay first 2s. for sending it over to the north side, and then 1s. 4d. for sending it to King's-bridge, when he can readily get it delivered at King's-bridge for 2s.?—We have taken four-fifths as the probable traffic that will be taken at the North Wall, leaving one-fifth to be carted from the south side of the city.

6098. Do you mean to say that you expect that four-fifths will be taken at the north side, or be carted from the south side to the north and put into your wagons?—I mean discharged from vessels direct to our wagons at the north side.

6099. And that they will be in the Spencer Dock?—No, but that they will berth in our own place. I will go even further, that even at present, except for fear of embarrassing our contractor, we could actually deal with the coal traffic now in our temporary condition.

6100. What do you calculate your traffic with the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford line?—Very trifling indeed. Coal is a small item compared with grain. It must be evident to every one in the room that the tendency of the grain trade is to centre on the north side of the city, and the position of our station is such, and the accommodation we hope to have will be such that we will command a very much larger share of grain traffic even in proportion than coal.

6101. Now, as regards the passenger traffic—do you think the North wall will diminish that to any great degree?—Well, it is difficult to give an opinion as to that at present.

6102. All the passengers to the Wicklow line would still have to go by the streets. As regards them there would be no change?—Yes.

6103. Will it affect passengers going to Amiens-street or the Midland any convenience?—No, it is not in contemplation.

6104. And so far as the morning boat is concerned you would not expect people who come up by your mail train at four in the morning to go on to the North-wall, so that anyone going by the half-past nine boat would go through the city?—Our trains are arranged to take the bulk of the traffic.

Report
Aug 24, 1872.

Mr. Robert
G. Colman.

DEBATE.
May 14, 1879.
Mr. Robert
G. Colman.

Mr. Alexander
McDonnell.

6105. So that you can't relieve the streets of much of the traffic by cabs and carts caused by passengers?—No, we don't make any point of that.

6106. Mr. Heron.—Is your new station where Miss William's property was?—Partly.

6107. Are you building a hotel there?—No.

Mr. ALEXANDER McDONNELL examined.

6108. Mr. Andrews.—Are you local Engineer-in-Chief, Mr. McDonnell?—Yes.

6109. Of the Great Southern and Western Railway?—Yes.

6110. You are acquainted with the extent of your works at Inchicore?—Yes.

6111. Be good enough to give the Commissioners some explanation enabling them to understand the extent of those works?—We have spent about £250,000 on the works there altogether.

6112. You have engine works, carriage factories, and workmen's dwellings?—Yes.

6113. How many workmen's houses have you?—144 or 145.

6114. About how many persons live there?—About 850.

6115. You yourself are personally very much engaged looking after matters there?—Yes.

6116. Are the sanitary arrangements and strict attention to?—Yes.

6117. And the whole of that district is well seen after—that it is kept in a clean and proper state?—Yes, it is.

6118. Would you be good enough to give the Commissioners some explanation about the coal traffic. I believe at the back of the East-wall you have railway communication already?—Coals don't run down there at present, but we have bought land there.

6119. But you have an Act for the purpose, and when you complete that will you, in point of fact, be able to take coal direct from that side of the river?—Yes.

6120. And will there be any difficulty about harbour accommodation?—I expect not. I expect there will be none at all. There is no doubt all coals going to the country will be discharged at the north and east side.

6121. Does your company use the streets of Dublin for the transmission of coals, rails, and stores, for the use of your works?—No.

6122. Now, I believe, there is a considerable quantity of coal carried from Inchicore by the Grand Canal?—Yes, between 22,000 and 24,000 tons.

6123. And the rails for Inchicore are by the North-wall Extension?—Yes, there would be about 5,000 tons a year of rails.

6124. And of sleepers?—About double that—about 6,500.

6125. And of sundry stores?—About 3,500 tons.

6126. So that between 34,000 and 35,000 tons you carry are not over the streets?—Yes.

6127. Now, do you take anything at all for Inchicore over the streets?—Yes; we have been in the habit of contracting to a large extent for goods to be delivered at Inchicore, and whoever contracts finds it difficult to send by rail, and so they send by cart. That is their business, not ours. These will all eventually go by rail. We are receiving many things contracted for twelve months ago.

6128. Now, as regards the water supply, what you use for the manufacture at Inchicore you take from the Grand Canal?—Yes.

6129. And for the dwellings, I believe, the supply is from the Vandy?—Yes.

6130. You manufacture your own gas?—Yes, we make the gas.

6131. And also supply Kilmainham with gas you make yourself?—Yes.

6132. We know the company pay £900 a year in town rates alone. Is there anything they have to give by arrangement—anything that Kilmainham could gain?—No, but I think there is a great deal to lose.

6133. Mr. Heron.—What have they to lose, and

what have they to fear, except the chance or prospect of increased taxation?—They have that, certainly.

6134. But suppose there is none?—I see nothing to gain.

6135. It is no matter to you, then, whether you are under Kilmainham or not, provided the taxes are the same? You have ample coverage for the labourers' cottages, and, so far as the railway is concerned, is it any matter to them whether the affairs are managed by the Dublin Corporation or the township, provided the taxes remain the same?—Well, the inhabitants of Kilmainham would not derive any benefit from being brought in.

6136. The CHAIRMAN.—But as to the railway?—Well, we have a large population of our own, nearly a thousand men.

6137. Are not they dependent on you?—Yes, but they use the district of Kilmainham.

6138. Well, but what difference will it make so far as the railway company is concerned?—[No answer.]

6139. Where do the people deal for all their commodities?—The chief place is in the co-operative stores of their own at Kilmainham; that is the largest place.

6140. Where do they get their other supplies?—I should say a great deal from England.

6141. Do they come from the railway or are they carried?—I should say they are carried.

6142. Do they not injure the streets of Dublin to a certain extent in having their goods driven across them?—No.

6143. Don't they soil the streets?—Well, the carts and carts that come from Dublin soil our streets, and we are paid nothing for it.

6144. But the Corporation propose to take your streets, and then you will have nothing to pay, because it will be borne out of the one fund?—I would rather they did not take our streets.

6145. Suppose they were as well kept by them?—But I don't think they would be.

6146. Mr. Heron.—Do you make your own carriages at Inchicore?—Chiefly.

6147. And where does the material come from?—Some from England, some from Ireland.

6148. What comes from Ireland?—Some of the oak.

6149. Where does it come from?—Down in the country.

6150. Do you make any locomotive engines?—Yes.

6151. How many first-class hands have you?—About 1,200. Of these, one-third live in our cottages, one-third in the district of Kilmainham, and one-third in Dublin.

6152. CHAIRMAN.—Do you supply your own people with coal?—No.

6153. Is the coal carried by them to the co-operative store?—I don't think the co-operative store supplies coal.

6154. Is it carried through the streets of Dublin?—Yes.

6155. What quantity of coal is consumed at the Inchicore premises and brought through the streets of Dublin from the south side?—I could not say; I could only guess at what each house consumes.

6156. But it would amount to some 100,000 tons a year?—Not so much as three tons a house on the average.

6157. Mr. Heron.—Do the railway company provide medical attendance for their servants?—No.

6158. CHAIRMAN.—If they are ill where do they go to?—They go home, or to Stewarts' Hospital.

6159. Do you happen to know, with reference to the drainage, how are the houses drained?—I don't mean your own, but are the houses generally drained at all?

DUBLIN.
May 26, 1873.

Mr. Alexander
McDonnell

—Well, if there was an outlet, there would be a main sewer running nearly parallel with the Canoe, and that would take the drainage, so that it could be carried off by a sewer, but the population is such that two-thirds of them would not make use of a sewer of that kind.

6160. Is the scavenging carried out at present?—Well, it is done indifferently in Kilmainham.

6161. How many scavengers are there?—Each house has to do its own scavenging.

6162. And where do they deposit the refuse?—That is their own business.

6163. You are a Commissioner, too!—Yes.

6164. Do you know that as Commissioners you are bound to do it?—No, but to see that it is done. That is, if there is a cesspool causing a nuisance from being full, it is our duty to see that it is emptied, but it is the duty of the person owning the cesspool to do it.

6165. Do you see that the thing is done?—We do, to a great extent. We are constantly summoning people for not doing it, and they are obliged to empty their cesspools.

6166. Mr. Horan.—Where does it go to?—Market-gardens, and so on.

6167. CHAIRMAN.—Who is the officer to look after this?—We have a Sanitary Officer whose business it is.

6168. Does he report?—Yes, every month, to the meeting. The Board makes an order to abate the nuisance, and if the order is not obeyed the man is summoned.

6169. And is it right, do you think, that at a monthly meeting you give orders to have a nuisance abated, and no further action is taken on it for a month, so that there may be a nuisance of a desperate character going on for a month and nothing done?—We are exactly in the same condition that two-thirds of Dublin is in.

6170. In Dublin they have a body sitting every day that can compel the parties to carry out the order. Is it only once a month your orders are made?—Yes.

6171. Well, Mr. McBirney, I think it was said for Demonsandra that they meet every week, and they are able to get their orders carried out.

6172. Mr. M'Donnell.—I thank you misunderstanding. It is only the people who have to be summoned with reference to whom we have to make use of orders—nine-tenths of the people clean out the cesspools when they are asked to do so.

6173. CHAIRMAN.—If that is so it is all right.

6174. Mr. M'Donnell.—I have 150 houses, and I never received a notice yet.

6175. Do you see that your houses are properly kept? Yes, and a great many others do. Mr. McBirney has cottages—they were once his—and they are all properly cleaned. A population like that does not benefit so much by drainage as you think.

6176. Mr. Corcoran.—Does not a great deal of drainage go into the Canoe?—Yes; but a great deal goes from the public mills above.

6177. Has there been any plan proposed for keeping that out of the Canoe, and disposing of it by irrigation?—No; we tried to find out if we could prevent its being put into the Canoe.

6178. Are you not the Sanitary Authority?—Yes; but we have no power over the river.

6179. But you can compel the Local Sanitary Authority above you to act?—We were advised not.

6180. CHAIRMAN.—That you could not prevent their sending a nuisance down to you?—Yes. I went into

the question once, but we could not prevent the mills sending refuse from the mills into the Canoe.

6181. Mr. Corcoran.—You were advised to that effect?—Yes.

6182. Dr. Norwood.—Was it before the inquiry you got the advice—before the inquiry at which Dr. Kennedy reported?—Yes.

6183. Have you had any advice since the Act of 1874, or the Pollution of Rivers Act passed?—Not that I remember.

6184. Then the advice was not subsequent to the passing of the Public Health Act of 1878?—No. I went into the matter several years ago.

6185. Have you put in operation the powers of the Act of 1878 with regard to nuisances?—Not with regard to nuisances.

6186. CHAIRMAN.—Do you send any of your own drainage into the river?—There are a number of cottages the drainage from which is delivered into the river. There is great difficulty in remedying it.

6187. Dr. Norwood.—Where are your summonses heard?—In the city.

6188. In the Metropolitan Police Courts?—Yes.

6189. And have not the magistrates assisted you in carrying out the Sanitary Acts?—Well, take this case. There was a man who built nine cottages at Islandbridge district. He had no parv accommodation whatever for them, and we had that man summoned over twenty times before the magistrates before we could force him to make proper accommodation for those nine houses, notwithstanding the order of the magistrates to have it done. There were two privies for the cottages, and I am sure we summoned him twenty times.

6190. How was that?—Sometimes from want of attendance—he could not attend; then some other reason, something informal in the summons, and, in fact, twenty different causes.

6191. But there was no indisposition on the part of the magistrates to facilitate you?—Well, they make many orders, but I do not say they saw them carried out.

6192. You did not see them carried out?—The magistrate would make an order that the nuisance be abated within twenty days. Well, the nuisance was not abated, and we had to commence all over again.

6193. CHAIRMAN.—But you had only to bring him up for breach of the former order, and he can be fined up to £10. for every day that it remains unfulfilled.

6194. Mr. M'Donnell.—That was going on for seven years, I know.

6195. CHAIRMAN.—I made an order that a nuisance in a house be abated within fourteen days, and that if it be not abated within that time the house should be shut up as unfit for human habitation until the order was obeyed—that was the order in respect not of one but of half a dozen houses. The Act appears strong enough if carried out. Have you any further evidence to give for Kilmainham?

6196. Mr. Andrews.—No, sir. We hand in a petition against annexation. (See Appendix No. 23.)

6197. CHAIRMAN.—We will now hear any evidence regarding Clogher.

6198. Mr. Charles Fitzgerald, Solicitor.—I may take this opportunity of stating, Mr. Commissioner, that it had been the intention of the Commissioners of Clogher not to appear here during this inquiry, but having heard the evidence given yesterday, and the reasons given by those who gave that evidence, Mr. Vernon did not like to let some of it go unquestioned. He, therefore, appears to day as Chairman of the Commissioners to express his views and those of the Board.

DUBLIN,
May 28, 1924.

Mr. John E.
Vernon.

Mr. JOHN E. VERNON Chairman.

6199. CHAIRMAN.—You are Chairman of the Clontarf Town Commissioners?—Yes.

6200. Are your body unanimously against annexation?—Yes.

6201. For what reasons?—We don't think it would be any benefit to Clontarf.

6202. On what ground?—Well, taxation is a very material factor in the consideration. We know what our own taxation is, and we don't wish to be brought within the city boundary.

6203. What is the taxation now?—Is 3d.

6204. Have you struck that for three or four years?—Yes. It includes the township rate of 2s., sinking fund 8d., water rate 4d., and sanitary rate 3d.

6205. Two shillings is the maximum rate?—No, 3s., to include everything with the exception of sanitary rate.

6206. Is it your opinion that the roads of the township are in proper order?—I think with the means at our disposal the roads are in a very fair condition; were it not so the County Surveyor has the power, under the section of our special Act, of requiring to the Grand Jury that they are not properly kept.

6207. Do you know whether he does inspect your roads?—Yes.

6208. And that he is satisfied with them?—He reported as to one part of our roads not being in as perfect a state as he would like, but on the other hand his own roads at Drumcondra were so bad that a public meeting was held to condemn them.

6209. Mr. Corriss.—Who is the County Surveyor?—Mr. Bell.

6210. CHAIRMAN.—One or two gentlemen stated that some portions of your roads were so bad that when you come to Aranescley-bridge you would at once know the portion kept by the Corporation from the portion kept by the township?—Well, the simple fact is that the city portion is asphalted up to the boundary and ours is not. Therefore, there is a marked distinction.

6211. That would only apply to the footpath, but what about the roadway?—Well, I don't know that there is such a difference in the roadways. I thought it was the footways that were referred to. I submit that the footpath is different.

6212. Is it your opinion, Mr. Vernon, that the sanitary arrangements of Clontarf are attended to?—Yes, we have a sanitary board, and the sanitary business is always taken first at the meetings.

6213. How often do you meet?—Twice a month at ten o'clock in the morning.

6214. One gentleman told us that the pipe of a water closet in the house next his discharged into an open yard, and that the stench of it was very bad, that he had called attention to it over and over again, but that it has been, nevertheless, left in the same state for a couple of years!—Yes, I heard that evidence given. It is not within my own knowledge, but probably the secretary would be able to say if he received any notice with respect to it.

6215. Do you remember its being brought before the board?—[No answer.]

6216. Mr. Donnelly told us that at Fairview several houses are in a very bad state as regards drainage; that the drainage is in a disgraceful state, and the smell most offensive; that in fact it is in a shocking state, and that he complained over and over again to the secretary, but got no redress!—The chief source of complaint comes from the neighbourhood of Ballybough-bridge. It is a low-lying district and some time ago the land in the occupation of Mr. Donnelly was slab land into which the tide flowed. I don't know under what circumstances Mr. Donnelly got possession of that property, and I would be glad if you asked him to produce the conveyance and to show the conditions under which he bought it.

6217. Mr. Corriss.—He said he had a freehold that he purchased in the Landed Estates Court, I think!—

I should be glad to see the conditions. The drainage there used to drain into these slab lands.

6218. CHAIRMAN.—But that should make no difference whatever as to the statement of the nuisance if it really exists. No man is allowed to put or maintain a public nuisance on any property. Every day such nuisance is put there, especially if it be an offensive and dangerous to health as was described by Mr. Donnelly, if it were only a bucket full, the party who puts it there commits an offence, and it is the duty of the Commissioners to prevent it. Mr. Donnelly, as a private individual, could prosecute the person creating the nuisance, but he says he reported it over and over again to the Commissioners as being the proper parties to have the nuisance abated, but he never got any redress!—I rather think there is some dispute between Mr. Donnelly and the Commissioners as to his privileges. It was slab land and every tide that came in flooded over that land, and carried away the nuisance.

6219. The question, Mr. Vernon, is—is the nuisance there; for if so, you are the nuisance authority, and ought to have it stopped, no matter who creates it or how it is created!

Mr. Vernon.—Yes; but there is a difficulty about the property there, and the drain is so circumstantial that there is no fall into the sea.

6220. CHAIRMAN.—That is what Mr. Donnelly says and puts forward, for he says, "We are too poor here, and have no funds to get the place properly drained and cleared, and what we want is to be annexed to Dublin, and then we will get properly drained from the Dublin side."

6221. Mr. Fitzgerald.—Allow me to ask Mr. Vernon one question. To your knowledge was there ever a complaint made by Mr. Donnelly and brought before the Commissioners?

Mr. Vernon.—I think Mr. Donnelly has in all probability written letters.

6222. CHAIRMAN.—That involves the question whether he ever made complaints, and whether those complaints were brought before the Commissioners. He says he has complained over and over again!—We certainly have had complaints over and over again of his interfering with our rights of drainage over that land.

6223. CHAIRMAN.—Now, we heard of some leases there, in which it is stated that the people throw the refuse of their houses, and also cabbage stalks and other vegetable matter, and that they have been allowed to remain there so as to become a nuisance at the back of—I think the "Emerald Isle" is the name of the place.

6224. Mr. Garry.—The "Life-boats" at the back of my house. My tenants have complained, and the refuse is coming through the yard, and the stench comes in. In my own house such is the state of affairs that I can't erect a water-closet for want of sewage. I complained often.

6225. CHAIRMAN.—Do you remember this case being brought before the Board?

Mr. Vernon.—No; but I may not have been present. I have no recollection of it.

6226. CHAIRMAN.—Are you satisfied with the sanitary arrangements?

Mr. Vernon.—No, not altogether satisfied with the drainage arrangements.

6227. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know that you can strike a sanitary rate to any extent to enable you to put it in order?—We have a sanitary rate, and, as far as possible, we attend to these matters, and make the necessary alterations as required. First of all, our medical officer must report a nuisance; then we direct our sub-sanitary officer to inspect, and, if necessary, we do our best to remedy it. It must, however, be first reported by our sanitary officer.

6228. Mr. Corriss.—The Secretary, I suppose, will be able to tell us if this particular thing was ever re-

ported it—Well, there was only one lone mentioned, I think, and it must be a very small back lane.

6239. CHAIRMAN.—Somebody else said the refuse was thrown over the foreshore wall—is that so?—Probably they do at night time. It is very hard to prevent that.

6240. Another thing they say is that when the roads are swept they are swept up on the footways and left there. The refuse is swept into the sheets, but it is said the mud is swept on the footways!—If that is the case it is then thrown over the wall.

6241. Do you mean the refuse is thrown over the wall?—A great deal of it is thrown into the shoreway.

6242. But the question is, what right have you to do that—is it not creating a nuisance?—There is no other way of getting rid of it. It is no nuisance there.

6243. A gentleman told us, as to the Rothamsted district, that the sweepings of the streets were placed on property at Kentish-town-square, and that the stench was dreadful.

6244. Mr. Vernon.—If there is any nuisance in this place it is carried away by the tide.

6245. Mr. Charles Fitzgerald.—Have you any idea what the death rate is?—Yes; I received a letter from our medical officer, stating that it is 14 per 1,000. I believe it is 29 in Dublin.

6246. CHAIRMAN.—Oh, yes, but you would not compare Dublin with Cleantarf.

6247. Mr. Kilkis, M.P.—What is done with a person who gets sick of a contagious disease?—A doctor is consulted and attends to him.

6248. Is it not often the case that the person goes to a Dublin hospital?—Yes, he might go to Dublin.

6249. And if he dies there he goes to add to the death rate of Dublin?—Yes.

Mr. Charles Fitzgerald.—But it is registered as from Cleantarf.

6250. Mr. Ellen.—As far as you know Mr. Donnelly made no complaint?—No, I am aware that Mr. Donnelly wrote several letters. I think there were certain matters between the Commissioners and Mr. Donnelly. We think he has encroached on our rights, and we would gladly have Mr. Donnelly to lay his correspondence before us.

6251. CHAIRMAN.—So far as I see, Mr. Donnelly disputes your right, which is, as you say, a right to discharge nuisance on his ground?

Mr. Vernon.—Before Mr. Donnelly bought this ground it was open slab land, and there were certain rights of drainage into it. Mr. Donnelly now thinks we have no right. He took it subject to these conditions, which enable us to put drainage upon it.

6252. CHAIRMAN.—Have you been advised that you have a right to discharge a nuisance into any man's land?—There is an open drain.

6253. What I want to know is, has anyone advised you that you have a right to discharge nuisance there?—I don't think we gave any permission to anyone—surface drainage from the road, and that sort of thing, is all that is put there.

6254. Mr. Donnelly complains that there is a well-defined and offensive nuisance coming daily into his place, and he certainly did produce some letter from your Secretary showing that you claimed the right to do so.

Mr. Vernon.—There was a neighbour of Mr. Donnelly's there, Mr. Reigh, and he, I believe, made use of this drain for throwing sewage into it. Mr. Donnelly wrote to the Commissioners, asking whether we had given him permission to discharge sewage into that ditch. Mr. Reigh never applied to us for permission, and we wrote to Mr. Donnelly to state so.

6255. CHAIRMAN.—I don't know how all that may be, but Mr. Donnelly tells us that he did not want to get into any law proceedings with anyone, that he looked to you, as the sanitary authority, "to prevent any man keeping a nuisance, or placing a nuisance on his ground, and he called on you to interfere, and stop it—that it was a public nuisance, and that you, as the sanitary authority, could prevent any man from

creating a nuisance on his land." The answer is—"Oh, we are not interfering with Mr. Reigh, or someone who claims a right to put a nuisance on your ground." Donnelly then says, "I call on you to do your duty, and stop this."

Mr. Vernon.—No, he asked us whether we had given permission to Mr. Reigh to do so, but made no further application on the subject.

6256. CHAIRMAN.—Why, he produced a letter, giving you two or three alternatives, and said if you did not interfere he would take proceedings, or some other threat.

Mr. Vernon.—Mr. Donnelly states that the Tolka river at his place is in a dreadful state. If it is it is owing to the Corporation having thrown a large drain into that river.

6257. CHAIRMAN.—If it is a nuisance, then, why not proceed against the Corporation?

Mr. Heron.—It is quite a mistake, nothing goes in there from the Corporation.

6258. Mr. Dennehy.—Does he deny that he put a siphon on the canal?

Mr. Heron.—Oh, yes.

6259. Mr. Vernon.—The Corporation struggled very hard to get permission to throw a drain into it. There was an inquiry under the Local Government Board. Virtually, we succeeded in resisting them.

6260. Mr. Heron.—You said, I think, that the results were kept as well as the means at your disposal would allow—have you sufficient means at your disposal?—I think the means at our disposal are not sufficient to enable us to do what we would like. We are limited to a certain income, and we endeavour to keep within that. When we inherited our responsibilities we inherited a white elephant in the shape of the sea wall, which was a constant source of expense. It was originally built in a bad way, it was handed over to us in a crumbing condition, and every year we have to spend money trying to keep it in order.

6261. Mr. Corcoran.—It was a county work?—Yes. The county repudiated it, and threw it upon the poor barony of Coolock, who in their turn wanted to repudiate it, and threw it on the parish; but when it came to the Commissioners we did what we could, and we tried to get the Port and Docks Board to do something, but they would not give a shilling.

6262. CHAIRMAN.—Did you oppose Cleantarf being made a township?—Yes. There were two parties with regard to the making of this township—one was in favour of it and one against it. There was a public meeting held in the parish, and there it was decided to form a committee of gentlemen to inquire, and investigate, and look into the matter thoroughly, to find out what the cost would be of keeping up the township. They reported at a future meeting the result of their investigation—we got all the information we could, and came to the conclusion that it would not be a judicious thing to form it into a township. We considered it was a long sea board, an improductive property, and that it would not be of advantage to the district to have the township. There was a stormy meeting after our report, and after discussion they carried a vote in favour of promoting it. I opposed it to a certain extent, because I considered we were not, after the inquiry that had been made, justified in promoting the change. After some opposition they gave way on certain points I insisted on, and I withdrew my opposition, and the Bill was passed.

6263. Mr. Heron.—Have you constructed sewers?—Certainly, we are always doing so. We have got three estimates at present before the Board.

6264. How much have you spent since the formation of the township?—I am not sure, the Secretory would be able to tell you. Cleantarf, I may say, is only a sort of road facing the sea—houses on one side and the sea on the other.

6265. Mr. Heron.—You know Brighton—it is four miles long!—You must not compare Brighton with Cleantarf. I should be very glad indeed to see that we were like Brighton in appearance or prosperity.

DUBLIN,
May 14, 1883.
Mr. John R.
V. Vernon.

BURTON,
May 14, 1879
Mr. John E.
V. Vernon.

Mr. Vernon.—Some years ago it was not such a great place.

6256. CHAIRMAN.—Were you here, Mr. Vernon, when Mr. White was arguing for the railway company?—No; I was about alluding to the fact that the Corporation did not like to take us in, because it is manifest to them that Clontarf is practically a bankrupt concern.

6257. Dr. Norcross.—The Corporation never said that.

Mr. Vernon.—I would like then to know why it is they did not like to bring us within the toils of the octopus.

6258. CHAIRMAN.—Now what they say is, there is a large tract of land between it and the city—a large quantity of arable land not built on, or likely to be built on, and in that way that it was different from the other townships.

6259. Mr. Vernon.—And that it would not contribute to their financial improvement.

6260. Mr. Beveridge.—It merely touches the city at a bridge.

Mr. Vernon.—Any way it was not from any kindly consideration towards us.

6261. Mr. Killen.—You say you are always constructing sewers—at what part of the township is that?—You can ask the Secretary as to those details.

6262. CHAIRMAN.—A gentleman stated yesterday that the roads were in such a bad condition that he has seen manure carts actually stick in holes in them, and that they had to discharge their loads on the road. Is that so?—Well, the farmer buys manure as much as he can carry in one load, and the consequence is that they bring in the biggest carts they can get and fill them with about two tons weight. As soon as they get outside the boundary they have other carts to meet them, and they transfer from the big cart to the small one. That repeatedly happened, and we repeatedly complain of it. That is the origin of that story.

6263. Mr. Killen.—Now, you say Clontarf is a long road, with one row of houses, and the sea opposite—are there not some roads running up from the chief road, such as St. Lawrence's road?—Yes.

6264. Is there any drain in St. Lawrence's road—in there a sewer?—Yes, a main sewer running from one end to the other.

6265. Put these by the Commissioners!—No; by Lord Hawth.

6266. You are levying the full rate?—Yes; £s. 3d.

6267. You know Castle-avenue—do the Commissioners generally reside in that neighbourhood?—I don't think they live very much together; they are pretty well scattered, I believe, over the district. One gentleman lives in that district that Mr. Densally represents—in the very heart of it.

6268. Now, these parts where the Commissioners reside, are they not better kept and attended to than the others?—I do not think so. The Commissioners naturally have their places in nice order—they are gentlemen who would wish to keep their places in order. I am perfectly sure the Commissioners do not try to favour their own districts; they do their best to benefit all parties. I can say that most conscientiously.

6269. You are not in the habit of walking in very much, so that the state of the roads would escape your observation?—I know the shore road very well, and I frequently walk in and out on it.

6270. Have you ever seen mud sweeping to the foot-way?—No; I have seen the scrapings of the road thrown into the sea-way.

6271. What about the lighting?—We do the best we can with the means at our disposal.

6272. You would do more if you had it in your power?—Yes.

6273. We don't blame the Commissioners. You are labouring under the common grievance of insensitivity?—We are struggling. If any gentleman thinks it to be a pleasure to be a Town Commissioner, I advise

him to try it. I can assure you it is a very troublesome and unuseful occupation, and a very thankless office, and without any remuneration. I may say, however, that we never had any dispute or discussion, or any unpleasant subject before us, since we became a township.

6274. Of course you take a great interest in Clontarf?—Naturally I do, holding a great deal of property there.

6275. How often does your Board meet?—Once a fortnight, and more frequently if there is any special reason for it.

6276. You are not satisfied with the roads and streets of Dublin?—I am not. I may say with reference to that memorial that has been handed in, that it has been in agitation since January last. I believe it emanated from Mr. Carey's house, as I have been informed, and there are thirty-eight names on it, out of a population of 4,000, and eight of these represent the publican interest. These public-houses are a very great nuisance, especially during Baldy-le-moors, when a number of roughs stop there, and ask for what they call refreshments, and they get drunk then, and it is with difficulty that the police is kept.

6277. Mr. Killen.—Are you of opinion that it is got up entirely by the publicans—the memorial?—Not simply by them, but to a great extent. The reason I know that is, because it was promoted very strongly by Mr. Carey, and at his house. I believe it emanated from him, and the publican interest is strongly represented in it.

6278. Where do you say it was originated?—I say I heard it emanated from Mr. Carey's house. The first time I heard of it was at Cuckoo Sessions, where it was said he was getting it up or was promoting it.

6279. Mr. Killen.—Well, that is a mistake. It emanated from a committee.

6280. Mr. Vernon.—Might I read something with reference to the sanitary state of the district? Our medical officer has reported, assuming the population to amount to 4,000, and the death rate 14 per 1,000. He says:—

"I believe the several epidemics I have had experience of in this neighbourhood have been in some measure modified by the natural salubrity of the district. During an epidemic of measles with a large number of cases, and one proved fatal."

That is from Dr. Fawcett. There were some observations made with reference to the police and the general condition of the place. It was said that the life of no man was safe, and a witness said that his own life had been in danger, or some very vague remark of that kind. The constabulary feel that an imputation rests on them, from the observations made it might be inferred, perhaps, that they are an inefficient body, and do not perform their duty. Mr. Hynes may not have intended to convey that, but it was felt by the constabulary.

6281. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Hynes rarely said it was impossible for the county police could do as well as the Metropolitan, because they could not, from their constitution, cope with the duties and requirements of the district, and, secondly, that they are not largely or numerously enough about the township.

6282. Mr. Vernon.—They are "tough," and have taken up the observations in a wrong spirit, and think no imputation of inefficiency was cast on them.

6283. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Hynes is here, and I did not understand him to impugn inefficiency.

6284. Mr. Hynes.—Certainly not. I guarded myself by saying so.

6285. Mr. Vernon.—Perhaps I may be permitted to read the letter which I have received from Mr. Heard on the subject, showing the number of patrols performed? He says:—

"Clontarf,
"My dear Sir,—
"24th May, 1879.

"I have seen in this morning's *Irish Times* a number of statements put forward regarding the constabulary of this

district which are far from being accurate, and as you are to give evidence in the matter perhaps it would be well that you should know that in Glanmire, Brancodra, Ballybaugh and Clontarf, there are now always on regular beat duty, besides the regular patrols. In Clontarf alone I give you a statement of the number of patrols performed by the men of that station, and if time permitted I could give you similar information as regards the other stations.

" Patrols performed by the Clontarf constabulary—January, 1878, 45; February, 1879, 44; March, 1879, 40; April, 1879, 37; May (23 days), 1879, 46.

MR. JAMES BALCOMBE examined.

DUBLIN.
May 24, 1879.
Mr. John R.
V. Vernon.

6288. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Secretary to the Clontarf Town Commissioners?—Yes.

6289. There was no surveyor?—No; but I do the duty of the surveyor.

6290. Are you a professional surveyor?—No.

6291. Did you ever read the Public Health Act of 1860 or 1874, or the Commissioners' Clauses Act of 1874?—I have. Whenever the services of a professional man are required he can be called in.

6292. You have read the Commissioners' Clauses Act of 1847?—Yes.

6293. Do you know that by that Act you are bound to have a surveyor, and he is bound to have a map on one particular scale, and on it to mark all sewers of the township, and to alter them from time to time as occasion requires—as the surveys are made? Do you know that?—Yes.

6294. That was never done?—No.

6295. Why?—Because I only succeeded to the office about four years ago, and it was not done then.

6296. Did you bring it under the notice of the Commissioners?—No; if it was in the Act of 1878, it was brought under their consideration.

6297. Is it your opinion that you were not to do anything under the Public Health Acts in force before 1878?—No; that is not my opinion.

6298. Were you there in 1874?—No; not till 1876.

6299. Did you carry out the Public Health Act of 1874 or 1866?—There is nothing in the Act of 1874 with regard to maps.

6300. But there is in that of 1866 which is incorporated with the Act of 1874—I never saw the Act of 1866. I don't think we have it.

6301. Have you never seen the Act of 1847?—I have, only lately.

6302. You were acting as secretary to the Board—do you know what your duties were, or the Board's duties?—Yes; the Act of 1847, however, was not there till the other day.

6303. Were you not aware from the book of directions you received from the Local Government Board, that you were told all the principal enactments relating to sanitary matters, sewerage, and everything of the kind, were in force under the previous Acts of Parliament, and were embodied in or supplemented by the Act of 1878?—I did not know that.

6304. What is your salary as Town Clerk?—£110 a year altogether.

6305. Are you executive sanitary officer?—Yes.

6306. What do you get for that?—£10 a year, included in the £110.

6307. For executive sanitary officer?—Yes.

6308. Have you a sub-sanitary officer?—Yes.

6309. What does he get?—£12 a year.

6310. For giving you his entire time?—No, he does not give me his entire time.

6311. Do you know that you are bound to have a consulting sanitary officer?—Yes; and so we have.

6312. And what is he paid?—Two guineas for consultation.

6313. Then you, yourself, are the executive sanitary officer?—Yes.

6314. Do you know that you are bound to have a sub-sanitary officer?—Yes, and so we have.

6315. What is his salary?—£12 a year.

"There were even more patrols performed in Ballybough in the same period.

"I am, yours faithfully,

"A. Hearn, S.I., R.I.C."

I thought it right to mention this.

6286. CHAIRMAN.—Quite right; but the only thing that was said was that the force was not large enough.

6287. Mr. DONNELLY.—When you wrote to me for the documents connected with my title I went out to you with them?—You did; you sent me papers, but I returned them to you.

Mr. James
Balcombe.

6316. What else is he?—Collector of the rates.

6317. The sub-sanitary officer?—Yes.

6318. Show me the book in which you are bound to keep an entry of what the Board desires to be done, and showing what has been done?—The only book we keep of the kind is a book with a copy of the notice.

6319. Did you ever see the book under the Public Health Act of 1874?—No.

6320. Did you ever inquire what your duties were under the Act of 1874?—I did the duties just as I found the place, and carried out all directions.

6321. Did you ever read the Act of 1874?—Yes.

6322. And the rules of the Local Government Board?—Yes; and the duty of the executive sanitary officer is to carry out the orders of the Board.

6323. Are you not bound to keep a book in which all this is recorded that I have mentioned, or did you ever see in your office such a book?—We have the sanitary minutes, of course.

6324. Did you ever see a book of that sort (showing book) sent forward by the Local Government Board?—Yes; we have that.

6325. Now show me the book kept in pursuance of the directions in that?—I have not got it here, it is in the office.

6326. And do you mean to say you keep a book in accordance with that form?—We have that book, of course, until 1878, and then there is a new form of notice, and the new form of notice is copied in the copying book.

6327. In the book of directions it is stated, the Public Health (Ireland) Act, 1874, contains besides those provisions which relate to the sanitary organization, many improvements and amendments of the previously existing sanitary laws; but it provides that enactments relating to water supply, sewerage, removal of nuisances, and the cleansing of those matters dangerous to the public health, are to be found in the Sanitary Acts previous to 1874?—Yes.

6328. Did you ever read the Act of 1866 or 1874?—This is the book I had to guide me. I may say, as to the map, that I saw that in 1878, making it compulsory to have this map in the office. It is under the custody of the Commissioners.

6329. This man, for £12 a year, is expected to look after all the sanitary arrangements of the township?—Yes, that is his duty.

6330. And do you expect to get a man to do that duty properly, if at all, for £1 a month, that is £6 a week?—Well, it is for the Commissioners to consider that.

6331. How many reports does he make?—Sanitary reports?

6332. Yes?—It varies; he made seventeen in 1878, twenty-six in 1879.

6333. You heard what was said by Mr. Donnelly in his evidence?—As far as Mr. Donnelly is concerned, there is an open ditch leading into the sewer, and Mr. Leigh, and the people of Fairview, have the right to discharge into this ditch. Some time ago a dispute arose about the cleansing of this ditch, and Mr. Donnelly said he had no right to cleanse it. I was asked to see Mr. Donnelly, and I did so, and ultimately the Commissioners undertook to have the ditch cleaned; but Mr. Leigh has the right, as I understand.

DECEMBER,
May 28, 1919.

Mr. James
Belcombe

stand, to discharge into this ditch, which has its outlet at Annexation Bridge.

6334. Is it a nuisance?—Occasionally.

6335. How long does it lie there a nuisance? Mr. Donnelly said it was there for months and months and was never removed. He said he wrote letter after letter threatening proceedings for allowing this nuisance dangerous to health and to the people in his houses. He says £36 is the rent he is getting for these houses, but that he would get £55 if they were any place else.

6336. Mr. Donnelly.—The Commissioners' men actually broke the drain to allow Mr. Reagh to put his stuff into it.

6337. CHAIRMAN.—Is that so?

Mr. Belcombe.—No, I tell you what was done. Mr. Reagh has built his house close to a private lane, there is a sewer there, and Mr. Reagh avoided himself of this private drain to drain his house into it.

6338. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Donnelly says, "I saw with my own eyes the Commissioners' men breaking up a place to enable Mr. Reagh to do this."

Mr. Belcombe.—That is not so—it is not a fact.

6339. Mr. Donnelly.—The Commissioners broke the road.

Mr. Belcombe.—Let me go further. The drain was choked up and the Commissioners' men cleared it—that is all. There is an opening from the road to receive the drainage from the surface of the road.

6340. CHAIRMAN.—Did you hear Mr. Carey say that in the yard adjoining his house there is a pipe from a water-closet discharging into the open yard? Did you hear him saying that, and adding that it was never removed?—Yes, I heard that, and I can say that he never drew my attention to it, or made a report of it.

6341. First of all tell me does it exist?—Not to my knowledge.

6342. Did you send your officer or go yourself there since yesterday to see if it was a fact?

Mr. Carey.—It is there yet.

6343. CHAIRMAN.—You know, Mr. Carey, may be telling what is not the fact, he says, however, "I am living in a certain house and a pipe comes down from a water-closet of an adjoining house and discharges in the open yard, and that the smell is intolerable." Now, I ask you now to say that is untrue. I asked him and he says it was there this very morning. That could be ascertained this morning if one only chose to do so. Did you ever go yourself and examine Mr. Carey's premises?—No, I never did.

6344. Would it not be best right of you, coming here to contradict Mr. Carey, would it not be only fair and right that you should have gone last night or this morning, or have sent your sub-sanitary officer to inspect the place, and then if it was found that the thing did not exist, you would be in a position to say that Mr. Carey was under a misapprehension. If a gentleman tells me most positively a certain thing exists, if he says, "I saw it this very morning, it is there under my nose," are you prepared to say it is not true?

Mr. Carey.—Within the last month I was obliged to get the place stuccoed.

6345. CHAIRMAN.—You based the statement by Mr. Carey yesterday, Mr. Belcombe, and would it not, I ask, have been but reasonable for you to have done what I say. You passed it this morning?—Yes.

6346. And could anything have been easier than to have gone and seen it yourself? You can't say if he is correct or not?—Not at this moment. I have the sub-sanitary officer here. I think I heard Mr. Carey say he did not know of the existence of the sub-sanitary officer at all.

6347. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, because he never saw any body going about in that capacity.

Mr. Belcombe.—The sub-sanitary officer is here.

6348. CHAIRMAN.—Who ever heard of a collector of rates being engaged as sub-sanitary officer at 5s. a week. Now you heard Mr. Carey referring to committee.

6349. Mr. Carey.—The lanes behind the whole range of houses at Fairview—it is filthy.

6350. CHAIRMAN.—He told us of refuse and vegetable matter and filth thrown there into this lane and allowed to lie festering there for months.

6351. Mr. Carey.—For years.

6352. Mr. Belcombe.—I don't believe it.

6353. CHAIRMAN.—You heard the gentleman saying he saw the nuisance this morning?—Yes.

6354. And you heard that statement made yesterday. Why did you not go and look for yourself before you say, "I don't believe it"? Why did you not go and see it? Mr. Carey lives close by himself and saw the lane. Were you in that lane lately?—No.

6355. Mr. Kilian.—Have you ever been up there?—It is a year since I was.

6356. CHAIRMAN.—And you the executive sanitary officer never went up that lane for a year?—No.

6357. You are only paid £10 a year for it?—Yes.

6358. Mr. Carey—I brought another gentleman with me to see it.

6359. CHAIRMAN.—Do you think there is light enough in the district?—A altogether?

6360. Yes, altogether.—I would rather have more light.

6361. Do you think the scavenging work is well performed?—As far as our means allow, I should say it is done satisfactorily.

6362. As far as the means allow?—Yes.

6363. Are you aware you can strike a sanitary rate to any amount you like?—Yes.

6364. And if you struck 5d. it would be better than 5d.?—Yes, I am sure it would.

6365. And why not strike it if it is necessary?—I am not answerable for it.

6366. As to the scavenging, did you hear it stated that the mud is swept on the footways?—Only in one place, and owing to accident.

6367. What was the accident?—It is just a particular spot at Martineau, where the footpath is worn away.

6368. And why is it not replaced?—Because money is not available.

6369. Then you agree with Mr. Donnelly and Mr. Carey that the Commissioners and yourself do your best with the money at your disposal, but that you have not money enough to make the township what it ought to be?—We certainly have not money enough to do what we would wish to do.

6370. Do you think the township should be annexed to the city?—Well, I don't think, in my position and in my official capacity, I should be expected to pronounce an opinion.

6371. What arrangements have you for a fire brigade?—We have hose forty feet long each—three lengths.

6372. Where do you keep the keys for the hydrants?—We have them in the office—in the township office, where we keep the hose.

6373. Is the water always at high pressure?—Yes, except when some of the arrangements are under repair.

6374. What staff have you for the scavenging and repairs of the roads?—Six men—five men and one overseer.

6375. What horses have you?—None; they are hired.

6376. Can you tell me, out of your account for last year, how much you paid for the hire of horses for scavenging?—Yes, about £120.

6377. For horses short?—Horses and carts.

6378. Have you a public audit?—Yes; at least an audit by two gentlemen elected by the ratepayers.

6379. Have you a copy of your printed accounts?—Not for last year. We have not the accounts audited yet.

6380. Have you for 77?—Yes, but I did not bring them with me.

6381. Have you much of a pauper population?—No, not much.

6382. How much?—Do you mean paupers?

6383. I mean labouring men—I don't mean the work-

house class, but artisans and labourers?—They are about 1,000, I fancy.

6384. If these people get ill, have you any disinfecting apparatus?—No; that is all under the North Dublin Union; they provide for that authority.

6385. But you are the urban sanitary authority?—Yes.

6386. Why did you not provide for the case—under the Act of Parliament you are the person!—Up to the present it has been done by the North Dublin Union.

6387. But they are not the nuisance authority. You are, and ought to provide a proper place. You have no hospital in the district?—No.

6388. Mr. Killen.—Have you a disinfecting chamber?—No.

6389. CHAIRMAN.—Have you any apparatus of the kind?—No.

6390. DR. NORMAND.—Do you contribute out of your rates towards the support of any hospital?—No.

6391. CHAIRMAN.—How do the North Union come to look after you at all?—I don't know; the system pre-existed before my time—before I came.

6392. And you have no place to send or remove anyone suffering from contagious disease?—Our sub-sanitary officer is a sanitary officer under the Board of the North Dublin Union.

6393. Then how does he give you all his time or any great part of it?

6394. MR. GEORGE TICKELL, J.P.—The fact is that portion of the electoral division extends out to the district. That is how it happens. They provide an hospital cab for the removal of small-pox patients. Our death-rate, I may mention, is 11 in the 1,000.

6395. Mr. Killen.—Do you think it probable that small-pox might occur?

Mr. Balcombe.—Well, it has occurred, but to a very small extent.

6396. Mr. Tickell.—The Commissioners are perfectly satisfied to let Mr. Donnelly's piece of land go into the city.

6397. Mr. Donnelly.—I would ask Mr. Balcombe is

he aware the nuisance is there near my house, and has it been removed—I mean human excrement along the roadside!

Mr. Balcombe.—I don't know.

6398. Mr. Tickell.—I may be able to explain about that.

6399. THE CHAIRMAN.—If such a nuisance exists it is the duty of the Commissioners to deal with it.

6400. Mr. Tickell.—If you had Mr. Donnelly to deal with, you would see the difficulty we are in. I say it is caused by Mr. Donnelly himself.

6401. Mr. Donnelly. (to the witness)—Is there a nuisance existing there now?

Mr. Balcombe.—I can't say there is. I have not seen it, and I walked up there yesterday morning.

6402. Do you mean to say the sweepings of the surface of the road are not sent on it from Annadale Bridge to Ballybough Bridge?—No, not to my knowledge.

6403. CHAIRMAN.—What is the poor-rate?—£s.

6404. MR. KELLEN.—I want to ask Mr. Balcombe a couple of questions. What is the condition of the roads as to crossings?—There are crossings at Ballybough Bridge, at the chapel, one at Fairview, opposite the butcher's shop (Fitzgerald's) and one at the Crescent.

6405. MR. KELLEN.—That one is going to the Commissioners' office, and that is the only one paved?—They are all paved.

6406. THE CHAIRMAN.—Are there any more than four?—There is one at Castle-avenue.

6407. If you had more money you would have more crossings?—Yes; one thing I may say. It was mentioned here that the Grand Jury had the power of interfering; well they only did so on two occasions in the beginning of '76, and the road was put in order at once. They gave ten days notice about it, and the next report of the county surveyor was, that the roads were in a favourable state. I can say this, that the Commissioners are doing all that is within their power,

and in a few years we will be able to hold our own.

Mr. GROGAN TICKELL, J.P. examined.

MR. G. TICKELL.

6408. CHAIRMAN.—You would not wish to be brought in to the Corporation?—No, I don't think it would be for the benefit of the Corporation or the Township. I have a very much larger interest in the city than in the township—three times in fact.

6409. Suppose now that Pembroke, Kilmainham, and Rathmines, or Drumcondra are suggested to be brought in, is there any reason why Clontarf should not be brought in?—We are about nine years in existence. I was one of the parties who opposed making it a township. The reason was, I thought the permission of it was not in the heads of people who were interested properly in the affairs of the township. I helped Mr. Vernon and other gentlemen, and we got certain omnibus clauses erased, and we were not left with a debt of £2,500. Before that time I think the payment was about £10*per* head, and for £2*per* head we were told (for that was what we committed with) for £2*per* head we were to have gas, water, roads, everything in fact. It was to be turned into a second heaven. But when we commenced working we had weekly meetings, and at length we found our means were not adequate to carry out our wishes. We found it necessary to get the Varsity, we got the Varsity. We found it necessary to get gas, we got the gas. We contributed by private contributions of our own to get tramways, and we have improved Clontarf to that extent. There is not a better managed township than Clontarf has been for the past few years. We are getting on very slowly, but very surely. We could not have a better officer than that gentleman who has just given evidence, though he seemed a little nervous.

6410. CHAIRMAN.—I am astonished that you could

ever expect any gentlemen to act as sanitary officer and do the duties for £10*per* head.

Mr. Tickell.—£100 a year, the £10 was added to him. He goes constantly about, and the sub-sanitary officer will tell you that this complaint of Mr. Carey's never came before us.

6411. CHAIRMAN.—What is the valuation?—About £14,000. We frequently had to contribute £15, £20, and £25, and the place is getting on exceedingly well—slowly but surely.

6412. When you say you have not had reports made to you, did you hear Mr. Carey's statement about the nuisance he complains of?—This place is at the back of his own private house, let at £40—it is a safe site—it had even gates which have been torn off it, and I presume Mr. Carey contributes very largely to it if there is a nuisance. In fact it has no right to be in our charge at all. It is really not in our charge at all.

6413. CHAIRMAN.—What I ask is, if there is a nuisance there, why does not the officer report it and compel Mr. Carey or any one else to abate it?—I believe our sub-sanitary officer and our sanitary officer—and we could not have better men—take the utmost care to discharge their duties.

6414. It is not a great pity that when the sanitary officer heard those complaints yesterday he did not go and see the place?—Well, I don't think the officer is obliged to set upon every statement of the kind. I may say the nuisance complained of does not exist at all, so far as the drain is concerned, for the houses have not been built yet—they are not finished or occupied.

6415. Mr. Donnelly.—They are indeed.

DEBATE,
Aug 24, 1876.

MR. G. TICKELL.

DUBLIN,
May 14, 1879.
Mr. G. Tickell.

6416. Mr. Tickell.—One house within the last fortnight, but the others are not.

6417. Mr. Dowdall.—That is the case I wrote about, and any letters I wrote were abortive.

6418. Mr. Tickell.—I consider Clontarf has made immense progress within the past nine years.

6419. CHAIRMAN.—What is the debt now unpaid on the township?—We owe £4,200.

6420. You paid off the difference?—Yes.

6421. Mr. Killen.—How do you hope to lessen the debt if you carry on the arrangements for the township as you ought?—There are comparatively few water-closets which contribute to the nuisance. Our district is largely an agricultural one.

6422. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Vernon has put into my hands a notice sent to all the houses requiring them to keep all the sash-panes and panes connected with those houses thoroughly cleaned for two months commencing 7th May, 1879, and that in default proceedings will be taken.

6423. Mr. Tickell.—The very fact of the collector

being sanitary officer makes him see what is the condition of affairs. Our sub-sanitary officer is an old constabulary pensioner and is exceedingly careful in trying to get what is necessary done without going to law.

6424. CHAIRMAN.—You say yourself you have not enough of men to do the work. The roads are not as they ought to be—you think so yourself—I think they are in a very fair condition and that they will contrast very favourably with any in this city. If you go to Mary's-lane which is a continuation of Mary's-street you will find something infinitely worse than anything in Clontarf.

6425. CHAIRMAN.—Would you think it advisable to get the Metropolitan Police?—No. It is right that I should say this—I have expended £15,000 in Clontarf, and I never lost to the value of £1 in the place. My property has been there exposed to everybody—bolts and bars, I think, are very seldom used there.

The inquiry was adjourned until the 1st of July.

DUBLIN,
July 1, 1879.

DUBLIN.—THIRTEENTH DAY, 1st JULY, 1879.

Before MR. EXHILL, Q.C. (Chairman), and MR. C. P. COTTON, C.M.

The inquiry was resumed in the City Hall.

6426. Dr. Norwood.—I wish to state that I appear on behalf of some rate-payers of Rathmines, and it is necessary, in the first instance, that I should make an application to you which is rendered necessary in consequence of a difficulty that the rate-payers have had in obtaining that documentary evidence which they require for the purpose of their case. And, accordingly, sir, I am instructed that on 10th of June, in the present year, Mr. Mark C. Bentley, who appears on behalf of those rate-payers, wrote a letter to Mr. Evans, Clerk to the Rathmines Commissioners, demanding copies of certain documents mentioned in said letter. To the letter they received a reply as follows:—

"Rathmines-road,
June 18th, 1879.

"DEAR SIR,—I submitted your letter of the 10th inst., with list of requirements mentioned therein, to the Board, at their meeting this day, and, in reply, I am directed to inform you that copies of all you require, with exception of 'addresses of outgoing Commissioners to rate-payers,' which they have not, will be ready to lay before the Municipal Boundary Commissioners, on their resuming the inquiry on the 1st p.m."

"Your obedient servant,

"JOHN H. EVANS, Secretary.

"Mark C. Bentley, esq."

You will perceive by the list of requirements that they are documents of very great importance, and it was impossible for Mr. Bentley, without having these documents before him, adequately to prepare whatever case the rate-payers intended to lay before you; and I now ask that these documents be produced, in order that Mr. Bentley may have an opportunity of seeing them, and making such examination of them as he may be advised. It is only part of the policy of which all the rate-payers complain—that these matters are kept secret, and that evidently arises from the way in which the Commissioners discharge their business in that township. I will, therefore, ask you to make an order for the production of these documents.

6427. CHAIRMAN.—I cannot make any order, but I presume they will be produced before us if required.

6428. Dr. Norwood.—I understand, also, a notice was served yesterday to produce the map which was spoken of when you sat last.

6429. CHAIRMAN.—That map was to be down here, and I have never seen it yet.

6430. Dr. Norwood.—It would be very hard to pro-

duce it if the evidence given is not incorrect. It would be very hard to produce it. First of all it was alleged that there was no map bound to be kept until the Act of 1878. Then, afterwards, it was said that there was a sewer map kept, and that it was open at the Town Hall, for residents to come and inspect, if they wished to see it, and I asked myself if that map could be brought down and shown to be the map required to be kept under the Town Commissioners' Clause Act of 1847. I have looked back to the evidence, and it was referred to by the surveyor of the township, and he stated that it was in a dilapidated condition.

6431. CHAIRMAN.—There was more than that, a great deal. It came out in the evidence of Mr. Bolton—there was fifty times more about it than that.

6432. Dr. Norwood.—We would like to see into these matters.

6433. CHAIRMAN.—I cannot make them produce the map if they won't; but there is this on the notes:—That the Commissioners of Rathmines were under the impression that there was no Sanitary Act in force, which compelled them to keep any map, or, in fact, do anything, until 1878.

6434. Mr. Macaulay, Q.C.—I appear now for the Rathmines Commissioners, and I am rather ready a disadvantage in the matter, appearing for the first time at an advanced stage of the inquiry. The only matter I would like to mention is that, having heard this statement from my friend, Dr. Norwood, I can tell this to him, and to the Commissioners, that all—certainly nearly all the documents alleged to be concealed or kept back, are the contents of matters that were printed and published in the newspapers at the time the occurrence referred to took place. There cannot, therefore, be any concealment about them. With regard to the other matters to which reference has been made, the map referred to was, I believe, already produced on the inquiry.

6435. CHAIRMAN.—Oh, never, and on the contrary, I can show you from the evidence that one party says it is in existence, and the other that it is not. The last day we sat I understood it would be very easy to produce the map, and I then called attention to the Act of Parliament. Then came the statement that they were not aware of that Act at all.

6436. Mr. Macaulay, Q.C.—The inquiry to-day was, I understand, for a certain specific purpose, and we have come here prepared to meet the case made against us.

6437. CHAIRMAN.—It may turn out that we may have

to sit at Rathmines, and probably will, because, as I have said before, having gone into all these matters, if we are prepared to recommend that Rathmines should not be added to Dublin, then there is the further question whether Terenure and Milltown should not be added to Rathmines. The Corporation are not interested in that.

6438. Dr. Newseed.—This question of the contract is a very important question. The legality of that contract has been directly put in issue. We have never seen that.

6439. CHAIRMAN.—The complaint made by some parties with regard to Rathmines is this—that they never got any satisfaction if complaints were made by them, that deputations were not received, and so on. They have an opportunity now of explaining these matters. The Penbridge people have explained them, and shown that every facility was given them. They produced all their books, including their "Complaint Book," where everything was regularly brought before the Board. These are letters on the notes to go into the appendix, which show that if complaints were made in Rathmines, the answer was that the letter was read, and that was all. We have it in evidence that a deputation waited on the Board of Rathmines Com-

missioners, and they would not be received. On one occasion when a deputation were granted an interview with the Commissioners they got not the least satisfaction—they were only told that the subject matter of their interview would be considered. All that is on the notes, and I think it is only fair that the Rathmines Commissioners should have an opportunity of answering those statements, and refuting them if they can, and we said at the close of the previous sitting that we would hear them on this day.

6440. The Rev. Mr. Shine.—Before the Commissioners hear their reply, there are three or four slight corrections that I would wish to make in the printed official report of my evidence. [The Reverend gentleman intimated the several corrections he wished made.] I may mention that since the Commissioners last sat, the roads of Rathmines have all been cleaned up, the men working almost night and day. I mention this in reference to the examination of Mr. Brett, whom they are going to produce, and who has inspected the roads. I may also mention that my own road has been cleaned three times since that, and, I think, it was not cleaned for that number of times for a whole year previously. What is the use, therefore, of bringing Mr. Brett now to speak of them?

Mr. HENRY BRETT, C.E., examined.

6441. Mr. Mousden, Q.C.—I believe, Mr. Brett, in consequence of certain statements that were made in the first portion of this inquiry with regard to the state of certain lanes and roads in Rathmines, you and Mr. Gray have made a special inspection of the roads and lanes in that place?—We have.

6442. That inspection, I believe, took place since the last meeting of the Commissioners?—Yes; on the 2nd of June.

6443. Now, did you particularly examine what we may call the permanent structure of the roads?—Yes; we did, carefully.

6444. State first what condition you found them to be in in that respect?—We found them generally in a very fair, and most of them in excellent condition—well formed, and the surface in an unobjectionable state, considering the weather that it has passed through, and considering the class of material used.

6445. I believe, as an engineer, you are able, from examining the sections of the roads, to form an opinion as to whether a road has been kept well—has been systematically fairly kept?—What I saw on the 2nd of June enables me to state that the great bulk was well formed, and fairly maintained, and that no reasonable, practical man could object to their condition, as we saw them.

6446. We all know that last winter was a very severe winter?—Yes.

6447. I suppose the extreme frost, and the frequent changes in the weather, were calculated to injure the surfaces of all roads?—Undoubtedly so; and I am sorry to say it has continued, to a great extent, up to the present.

6448. Having regard to that, do you think on the occasions on which you visited those roads, and inspected them, that they were in what we call average good condition?—I think so; I have no doubt about it. I think they are in fair, good condition, considering all the circumstances of the case.

6449. Does that apply to the majority of roads?—Certainly.

6450. Did you visit the lanes?—Every one of them.

6451. Did you find any deposit of miasma of old standing, such as would arise from the lanes being in the dirty condition described?—We found what is likely to occur in other places—recent deposits of soil and filth, and manifestly placed there shortly before we visited them.

6452. Of course, recent deposits, but no appearance of a system of neglect of the lanes, such as has been described?—No.

6453. Are you aware what the total length of the roads and streets in the township is?—Between 21 and 22 miles.

6454. Have you ascertained what the expense and cost of maintaining them has been?—The expense, as reported to Mr. Gray and myself, averaged about £160 a mile—about £3,000 a year. I think it varied—sometimes more, sometimes less.

6455. Does that include the amount spent in footpath repairs—kerbing, and so on?—I don't know whether or not it includes the kerbing, but it includes the asphalting of some pavements and the graveling of other portions. I am not quite sure about the kerbing. My colleagues now tell me £150 a mile includes all.

6456. Does it include, also, adjusting the water pipes, and so on?—I believe it includes all the expenses of the surface of the roads.

6457. Did you examine the establishment that was kept up for the purpose of carrying on those repairs?—Yes, carefully.

6458. Did you see what appliances they had there, and what means they had of carrying out these repairs?—We saw the horses and carts, and all their appliances for repairs and the conveyance of material, and everything seemed to be of a first-class description.

6459. Did it appear to be a well-organized establishment?—Yes.

6460. And with a proper supply of the various appliances?—Quite ample for the care and maintenance of the township. The horses were very good and well fed, and the carts were in good condition. The horses and all the other appliances were very good.

6461. Did it appear to you, from your experience, to be sufficient for, and suited to the requirements of the township?—Quite so.

6462. You mentioned that you have been at the premises. Did you see the number of horses that were there?—There were 8.

6463. And how many carts?—There was a certain number of carts for the conveyance of material, and there were also carts for watering the roads.

6464. It would be as well to have the number of the carts?—There are 8 horses, 8 scavenging carts, 8 watering carts, 3 ordinary drays, a one-horse brush, 8 drivers, and 30 labourers.

6465. Do you think that sufficient to keep these 20 odd miles of roads in order?—I do.

6466. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean, Mr. Brett, to say that you consider that a good supply of horses for the 22 miles, or 23, as it was stated before. First of all,

BOSTON,
July 1, 1872.

DEBATE
July 1, 1882.
Mr. Henry
Bentley, C.

should a street be swept every day?—That depends on the state of the weather.

6467. If you have dust in the summer, and dirt in the winter, would not that want to be swept?—You cannot have them continuous.

6468. How would you manage that 23 miles of roads and lanes with a staff of 20 men—is a staff of that strength sufficient to do that?—I think it is quite sufficient.

6469. All I can tell you is that you don't agree with Mr. Vernon?—Well, I don't know about that.

6470. Mr. Monahan.—Did you notice in use in the establishment a composition of gravel and pitch, to be applied as a substitute for asphalt?—Yes, we saw it in a state of preparation, we saw it being laid down, and we saw its condition after it had been laid down, and it appeared to us to be not only very economical, but it answered the purpose very well indeed. It is a cheap and useful material.

6471. From your observation, did it produce a good surface?—Yes. The Bathsheba Commissioners adopted, in my opinion, a very judicious course in reference to the foot-paths in using that material for the repair of the asphaltic footways from time to time.

6472. Then, from your observation, it was a good thing for that kind of work?—Yes.

6473. CHAIRMAN.—Is that asphalt, properly so called, as laid down in Pembroke?—No, it is not. It is a cheap substitute that answers the purpose very well.

6474. Mr. Monahan.—From observation, were the footways with this preparation on them in fairly good order?—They were.

6475. I believe that description of pavement is called tar pavement?—It is a mixture of tar, pitch, and gravel carefully prepared, and makes a very good substance.

6476. With respect to the materials that are used in the roads, what opinion did you form with reference to that?—In my opinion the great bulk was very fair. There was some limestone gravel, and some of a calyp nature that was not so good; but the great bulk was very fair good material.

6477. Did you observe, in reference to the crossings, whether there was any improvement?—There were several crossings, but one of the matters that occurred to us was that the township wanted several more crossings, and also that the paving of the water tables would be very desirable.

Cross-examined by Dr. Norwood.

6478. Were you here during the examination of the witnessess?—A portion of them; I was not very much here.

6479. Are you prepared to contradict Mr. Bentley, Mr. Bradbury, Mr. Hanson, Mr. Jacob, Mr. Magor, Mr. Mayall, and the Rev. Mr. Share, as to the state the roads were kept in, while they were living there for years?—I am not prepared to answer any allegations of theirs; I am merely prepared to give my own opinion on what I saw.

6480. When did you make the inspection?—On the 2nd of June, and several times before that.

6481. You are the County Surveyor of Whitlow?—Yes; I am.

6482. You make your inspections periodically?—I do.

6483. Did you ever know that road contractors prepare for the visit of the County Surveyor?—Sometimes they do; but I did not depend upon that at all.

6484. Would you be surprised to learn that more activity was displayed by the Commissioners of Bathsheba since this Commission adjourned, than for years before?—The result of my examination would not lead me to believe that at all, for there was no preparation, for the eye would have seen it at once, and that was not the case.

6485. Would you know whether a particular place had been scavenged the day before or the week before?—I would expect it was scavenged from time to time as required.

6486. Do you think there is a sufficient number of crossings—one, between Periobello Bridge and Bathsheba?—I don't think the number at all sufficient.

6487. It was stated that there was only one?—I think there was a number of fair crossings, but nothing like the number that is required.

6488. Supposing a gentleman living there said there was only one, would you contradict him?—I would not.

6489. It is the principal road to Bathsheba, and the line used by the tramways?—Yes.

6490. Is not the centre of the road maintained by the Tramway Company?—Yes; as far as they are bound.

6491. Does your evidence relate to the roads as well as other places?—Yes.

6492. But the Bathsheba Commissioners are not responsible for those on which the trams run?—Yes, they are, for the margins of them.

6493. Do they repair the centres of those roads?—The Bathsheba Commissioners don't repair what the Tramway Company does.

6494. Are they bound to scavenge that portion?—They are. I have not said that the margins are in bad repair, but I have said that the water tables could be paved better.

6495. Supposing it was proved that the mud was swept up to the sides of the streets, and allowed to remain there for several days, would you think that desirable?—I didn't see that.

6496. Supposing that was done. It is alleged that the state of things has improved since this came out in May last?—I have had frequent opportunities of seeing that before, and I saw on some occasions that that was the case, on others that it was removed at once, but I would say that the result of my experience would not agree with what those gentlemen say.

6497. Some of these gentlemen said that they have seen a week after week left on the roadside?—Yes; perhaps wrongly.

6498. That for long after being swept the mud was never carted off—would you think that right?—I would not.

6499. Would you tolerate such a thing in Bray?—I would not.

6500. Would you reply to a letter calling attention to the condition of the lanes and roads, or would you give no reply?—I cannot answer that at all.

6501. Do you think twenty men sufficient for scavenging twenty miles?—With the one-horse brush, I do; quite sufficient.

6502. You say that twenty men would be sufficient if the twenty men would work?—Certainly; I assumed with that number they had all the appliances.

6503. But if you were told that there was no constant inspection, by reason of the surveyor being employed on other business—what would you say to that?—I would be very much surprised if that were the case. I think if the men killed their time they would not have the township in the condition I saw it.

6504. Are you prepared to contradict the gentlemen who said that the men were idle, and didn't work?—I cannot answer for that.

6505. What do you mean by the phrase "considering the circumstances of the township"?—I think from the state of the weather, and several of the roads being new roads, and only recently formed, and the class of material which is used in some parts of them.

6506. Do you think it necessary that the surveyor of that large township should give his entire time to the discharge of his duties?—I don't think I should be asked to answer that question.

6507. Your roads are principally county roads—Are.

6508. Are the roads of Bathsheba in as good a condition as those of Pembroke?—I think the roads of Pembroke are better, and that better material was used on them.

6509. Would you say that the footpaths are properly kerbed?—Not all of them.

6510. Would you say that in Rathmines?—I would not.

6511. Did you see the asphalt in Pembroke?—I did.

6512. Is it good enough?—It is.

6513. Is it of a better quality than Rathmines?—The material used in Rathmines is a different substance. It is a mixture of tar, pitch, and gravel, and makes a very fair, good, and cheap substitute.

6514. Did you inspect Grosvenor-road, West?—I did.

6515. Is that road kerbed?—No.

6516. There are houses there of a good class?—Yes; some of them are recently built.

6517. And the footpath opposite them is not kerbed or asphalted?—No.

Mr. R. A. GRAY, examined.

Mr. R. A.
Gray.

6518. Mr. Moseley.—You are the surveyor of the county Dublin?—Yes.

6519. You have heard Mr. Brett's evidence?—Yes.

6520. Do you agree with the statements he has made?—I do, generally speaking. With regard to the sections of the roads, he does not appear to be so well acquainted with them as I am. I have been fourteen years in the township.

6521. And therefore you are thoroughly acquainted with the sections of the roads?—I am.

6522. As a skilled engineer are you able to tell us that the condition of the sections enables you to form an opinion as to the manner in which the roads have been kept for some years back?—I made the measurements of the sections at the time I inspected them with Mr. Brett. They were very perfect, and that resulted from the permanent character of the repairs; that could not have been brought up suddenly by any sudden application of materials.

6523. Did the indications of the sections satisfy you as an engineer of long experience that the roads must have been properly kept?—They were well consolidated sections. The sections were right good.

Cross-examined by Dr. Norwood.

6524. Were you in Kenilworth-square?—I was.

6525. Did you observe the grass growing alongside the road?—I did.

6526. Would you allow that on a county road?—I could not help it.

Re-examined by Mr. Moseley.

6527. Did you hear it stated that there was only one crossing from Partobells-bridge to the Bathgate-road?—I did.

6528. Do you remember how many crossings there are?—I cannot tell you that.

6529. Do you recollect whether or not there is any crossing opposite the Rathmines chapel?—I believe there is; I see people get out of the trains there every Sunday.

6530. With reference to the Pembroke township as compared with the Rathmines township—is it not a fact that the Pembroke township lies considerably lower than the Rathmines township?—It does.

6531. And that the soil on which the Pembroke township is built—is not for a considerable portion at all events—naturally damper, and that it is therefore more difficult to keep the roads in proper condition than in Rathmines?—Certainly.

6532. And is it not the case—taking miles for mile—that in your opinion it would cost more to keep the Pembroke roads in order than those of Rathmines?—Yes, I think so. The cost of keeping up roads depends in great measure on the material used.

6533. Where round gravel is used instead of spar material, there is increased dirt?—Yes.

6518. CHAIRMAN.—As the surveyor of Brix you yourself do you look after and see that the house drains are connected with the main sewers?—Certainly.

6519. And you have a proper map of the sewerage?—Yes; we have.

6520. You have always kept such a map?—Yes; for the last thirteen years, and every drain is marked upon it, and also the levels are indicated on it.

6521. Do you think it is part of the surveyor's duty to see that that is done?—I think it would be very advisable to see that it is done. I think it is necessary to have it done.

6522. If there is not a proper map showing the levels of all the sewers, as provided by the Act of Parliament, how can any builder going to build a new house know how to lay down sewers?—I think such a map should be provided.

BRIXTON.
July 5, 1881.
Mr. Henry
Brett, c.e.

6523. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Vernon says that all the roads made through the Pembroke township were made of the best material possible?—They are made of Kilburn gravel.

6524. He says it would cost less to keep them—from the way in which they were made originally, and the way they are shaded by proper water channels—than the roads in Rathmines?—I cannot say, I speak from my own experience.

6525. Mr. Moseley.—You are aware of the nature of the Pembroke roads—you have seen them?—Yes.

6526. And also the Rathmines roads?—Yes.

6527. Having regard to what you have mentioned already with reference to the materials, and also the other circumstances—are you in a position to say that the Pembroke roads would necessarily cost more than Rathmines, and require a larger staff?—I believe they would, and in a great degree in consequence of the materials used.

6528. CHAIRMAN.—What sized gravel would you say should be used on a footpath?—I think first there should be a layer of coarse gravel—the size of peas—in forming it, and then a layer of nice sifted sand.

6529. What would you say if some of the gravel used on the footpaths in the township was lumps of stone nearly as large as the ink-bottle on the table before you?—I think that would be wrong. I saw the footpath, and saw nothing of the sort.

6530. A gentleman produced a piece of stone here to prove his statement to that effect?—I looked at the place opposite Mr. Shire's place, and saw nothing there that would justify such a statement.

6531. What Mr. Shire stated, was that he picked up such a stone on the footpath?

6532. The Rev. Mr. Shire.—I will give £5 to any charity, if Mr. Brett and Mr. Gray will come out to my place, and if he does not find a stone as large as the one I produced. The one I found and produced I picked up on the footpath.

6533. Witness.—What we found were about the size of an ordinary gooseberry.

6534. CHAIRMAN.—Those referred to were not the size of gooseberries at all; they were the size of hen-eggs?—I have had brickbats and oyster shells produced to show that that is what a road is being made of. But I have not found what was stated at all.

6535. Mr. Shire.—Did you visit the Leinster-road at all?—Yes.

6536. Can you tell me how many crossings there are at the Leinster-road?—One or two. There are three crossings on the Rathmines-road. There is one at the Roman Catholic Chapel, and one at Leicester-square.

6537. Mr. Evans speaks of the splendid horses used in the township by the Commissioners. Did you ever see them drawing half a ton of mud?—I have seen them drawing heavy weights.

DURHAM,
July 1, 1873.
Mr. H. A.
Gow.

6564. Were they too fat to go at an ordinary quick pace?—I think not.

6565. There is a road called Bathmains-avenue, up to the convent. What is the formation of that road?—I think it is of a good formation. It is of convex formation.

6566. I venture to think it is as flat as the table, and there have been three inches of mud on it in wet weather—

6567. CHAIRMAN.—We have your evidence on that already.

6568. Mr. Shire (to witness)—Did you visit Maxwell-road?—I did.

6569. What state is that road in?—I didn't find any mud at all upon it.

6570. There are usually six inches of mud on it?—I didn't see any upon it when I was there.

6571. When did the Commissioners lay out 6d. on that road?—I cannot say.

6572. Did you visit Castlewood-lane?—I did.

6573. What means is there there for taking off the surface water, and the water that comes out from under the houses?—I suppose the lane you mean is Cullen's-lane?

6574. No, Castlewood-lane—down off Castlewood-avenue?—I found there was no deposit of silt or soil of any standing. The lane was not well kept, so far as its state of repair was concerned, but there was nothing to justify any statement that it was in a filthy condition.

6575. CHAIRMAN.—Don't be under any misapprehension. It was admitted here that the lanes were in that state, and the statement was that they were not looked upon as belonging to the township at all, but as private property. There was no excuse made.

6576. Rev. Mr. Shire,—When did the Commissioners clean Castlewood-lane?—I cannot answer that question. There was no particular ditch upon it except some little matters of offal thrown out there recently.

6577. You have visited Church-place—off Church-place?—I have.

6578. What means is there for taking off the surface water there?—I think that means are required for taking off the surface water there. The channels require to be paved.

6579. You visited the lane at the rear of Belgrave-square and Belgrave-road?—Yes, I did.

6580. You got that pretty clean?—There was no particular deposit upon it. There was only dirt which might be expected to be in such a lane.

6581. Supposing you saw a lane for months full of leaves and vegetable stalks, and refuse of all kinds, and it remained there, what would you say to that?—I think it would be very wrong.

6582. More than one of the witnesses has seen that with his own eyes—I have not seen it.

6583. Would it be true if I stated that a clergyman lived for eight or nine months with a delicate son, in Belgrave-square, without getting that lane cleaned?—I don't know anything about that.

6584. You went up our road, and you didn't see any pavingsstones on the foot-path?—I did not.

6585. I believe you drove up the road?—I drove up first, and then walked it.

6586. In what state were the walks on the roadside at Windsor-road?—They had fresh gravel on them.

6587. Did you pass there a foot and a half high?—I don't think I saw grass a foot and a half high anywhere. I saw some on the margins of the foot-paths.

6588. What do you say to the water in a great portion of the township being shut off from 9 o'clock at night until the next morning?—I don't think that is a good arrangement. I think that is very objectionable.

6589. What do you say to having a hose which lets the water come out in every direction but the right one, so that it half-drowns the people who tried to use it, instead of putting out the fire—what do you say to that?—I think it very wrong.

6590. Were you through Castlewood-avenue?—Yes.

6591. Is the foot-path level with the road there?—It is very little over the road.

6592. It is not all Kept!—No; it was originally hardly formed. It has fallen away on the lower side.

6593. Would you give me a list of the roads through which the tress run—both new and old roads?—I could not tell you them.

6594. CHAIRMAN.—What would be, in your opinion, a proper sanitary staff to look after, and see that a town of 23 miles of roads, and all the houses on those roads were properly attended to?—Is it for the scavenging alone?

6595. I mean a sanitary staff to watch the scavengers, and see that they do their duty—to report nuisances, and so on—I could hardly answer that question, because I don't know how the drainage of Bathmains is circumstanced at all.

6596. Don't you think they would require a larger sanitary staff in Bathmains than in Bray?—I should say at least, including the Town Clerk—the Executive Sanitary Officer.

6597. How many besides him?—I should say three or four of the staff should be deputed to attend to the sanitary work.

6598. What would you think of a staff composed of a pensioned policeman—a man who cannot be less than 50 or 40 years of age—at a salary of £10 a year, and a half porter. That is all they have in Bathmains.

6599. Mr. Evans is the Executive Sanitary Officer and he is the Town Clerk, and the Town Clerk of each a district is supposed to be at his office for a number of hours in the day. Then they have a police sergeant—a pensioned officer of the Police Force—and then they have a half porter. That is all they have to look after twenty-three miles of roads, to look after the sewers and house drains, and see that the drains of the houses are connected with the main sewers. What do you think of such a staff?—I think it would not be sufficient if those two men's services were confined to making examinations, and reporting to the Executive Sanitary Officer, and then that the labourers would do their duty and make reports also—if they were confined to that the work ought to be properly done.

6600. CHAIRMAN.—One of them is a half porter, whose entire salary is £10 a year, and that man has charge of the Fire Engine!

6601. Mr. Monahan—I am instructed to say that in making that statement you are labouring under a misconception.

6602. Mr. Evans.—His salary is £15 a year as sub-sanitary officer, and £10 a week as half porter.

6603. CHAIRMAN.—Therefore, if he is to attend to his duties as sub-sanitary officer, for which he receives £15 a year, he cannot give any value for his £10 a week. He cannot be like Sir Boyle Roche's herd, in two places at one time.

6604. That man has to look after twenty-two miles of roads and lanes, to examine cesspools, to see that cesspools are kept in proper order, to see that the houses are connected with the main drainage, to look after the Fire Brigade, the fire engine and hose, and so on. Do you think that that is a sufficient staff?—I should say not.

6605. Do you think that the water supply of Bathmains is satisfactory?—I think they should have a higher pressure.

6606. Dr. Norwood.—Do you think they should have the Vaux water there?—I do not think there is sufficient pressure at present.

6607. About eighty feet is the highest pressure in Bathmains.—It is 180 feet in Bray.

6608. Mr. Gray.—I don't see the necessity for the Vaux water at all.

6609. Dr. Norwood.—Do you say then that there is sufficient pressure in Bathmains?—I should say there is not; but there is a very good supply for domestic purposes.

6610. But what do you say to 1,000 houses being left from 9 o'clock at night until six in the morning

without a drop of water for fire purposes!—I should say it is not right.

6601. Is there anything like a Fire Brigade there at all?—There is no Fire Brigade.

6602. We were told for some time that there was a staff of men who could be used for the purpose!—Yes; but there is no organised Fire Brigade there at all.

Mr. FREDERICK STOKES, examined.

DRAPER
July 3, 1875.
Mr. B. A.
Gray.

Mr. F. Stokes

6604. Mr. Monckton.—Mr. Stokes, I understand you were away during the earlier stages of this inquiry!—Yes; I live in England.

6605. You were very well acquainted with the township of Bathurst for a great number of years, and you were chairman of the Bathurst Commissioners!—I was.

6606. I am just going, in proper order, to call your attention to certain matters that were mentioned on the last day of the inquiry, and I will ask all the attention you can give to the Commissioners on the subject. And the first matter I shall deal with is this: is the statement that the Commissioners were owners to a considerable extent of large property in Bathurst, and that they abated the taxes in that district because they had a pecuniary interest in regarding taxation to the lowest possible limit—in fact starving the district by their operations—is that the fact?—There is no doubt, to some extent, that is so. The Board always contained a considerable proportion of owners of property, and I am of opinion ought to do so; but there was also a considerable proportion of persons who had no interest in large property save the houses they lived in. As to keeping down taxation, I am the principal person to blame for that.

6607. Can you tell how many of the Commissioners are house owners?—If I had a list of them I could tell.

[List of Bathurst Town Commissioners handed to witness.]

6608. Witness.—There are ten who have no houses, and eleven who have.

6609. That is to say there are ten who have no property!—There are ten who are only occupiers, or who own their own houses only.

6610. Can you tell us from the paper you have in your hand about the amount of rental and taxation of those persons?—You had better get that from Mr. Evans, because I have no personal knowledge on the subject.

6611. Another matter was mentioned with reference to the audits!—If you like I will go through the evidence and deal with it myself. The first statement I shall refer to is in the evidence of the Rev. Loftus Shire, and it is in reference to the audits. [Witness then read the portion of evidence referred to.] A more unfair and dangerous statement than that could not be made. I will tell you the facts of the case. A regulation under the Act was sent, not to the Board, but to me, to whom the Act provided it should be sent. It was completely imperfect, and if I had called a meeting it could not have been opened, because there was no clause of the Act in it.

6612. Was that the first regulation or the second?—The first. I took the regulation to Mr. Fitzgerald, my solicitor, and the Board's, and took his opinion upon it, which didn't cost the Board anything—because if it was charged at all, it was charged to me—and he drew out for me a requisition complying with the terms of the Act. I sent that requisition to the gentleman from whom I had received the other, Mr. Scott—who behaved all through very much like a gentleman—and instructed him that it was to be put in that form. We didn't hear anything for a long time afterwards, and he then came again, not with the other had ended, but with an exact copy of what Mr. Fitzgerald gave me, and I had sent to Mr. Scott. As soon as we received that requisition, having previously received the instructions of the Board on the subject, I wrote to Mr. Shire—whose name happened

to be the first one on the requisition—and he was therefore the proper person to write to—that the Board would offer no opposition to the Government audit, and I received a very civil note from the reverend gentleman in reply. We are always punctual at our meetings in Bathurst. He speaks of one or two Commissioners being there. It was not one or two, but six Commissioners were there, and the requisitions were not there at all. I put the question according to the Act, and the whole thing was done in that way. I would like to know what imputation could be made about that statement of facts. I would like to know what I could have done that I didn't do. The next point I shall refer to, is Mr. Shire's evidence, with reference to co-option. I have to say [witness having read the evidence] as to that—with regard to co-option, that it is not a power possessed by our Board alone, but by every Board in the kingdom in the same way. We have no option but to fill up by co-option when a vacancy occurs, and we have always done so to the best of our ability. With regard to a member of the Board retiring for the purpose of the re-election of another member, that occurred only in one case, and it happened to be my own. On the occasion of the first election I lost my seat, and another gentleman made room for me. In that case, the system of co-option was resorted to—made by a member resigning for the purpose. Whenever a vacancy occurred, we did our best, and I am accountable chiefly for the selection of the men, and we found it exceedingly difficult to get good men. We certainly did put in some men who had been rejected by the ratepayers, but we also put in others who were put forward by the ratepayers, but who were unable to secure a sufficient number of votes to procure their election. Dr. Wright was one, Mr. Plunket was another, and there are others I could name. Mr. Eaton was not co-opted. He stood and was defeated, and the Board adopted him the next time, as one of their candidates. Mr. Mark Bentley, who has devoted so much time to opposing the Commissioners, was co-opted by the Board twice, and he deserved it well. He was subsequently rejected by the ratepayers, and we co-opted him again; and I believe he was the only one rejected. At the next election he stood upon his own hook; that was the third time of his seeking election, and he was again rejected. That is a fair summary of the charges that have been brought against the Board. There were one or two cases of rejected members who were Roman Catholic being retained on the Board, and that feeling of desire to keep them on the Board was caused by the fact that otherwise they would be sure to lose their seats, because the majority was a conservative one.

6613. They were some of those who were co-opted afterwards!—Yes, Mr. Murphy was one; Mr. Plunket was another, and Mr. Doling was one—in fact I should have mentioned before, that we rarely had a contest at all. For fifteen years, there was only one contest, but the election of every member of the Board that is at present on the Board, has been ratified by the ratepayers. He then goes on, at page 292—the last question “I have ceased bringing anything before the Board.” . . . and so on. Well, all I can say in reference to that, is that every letter as it came in was numbered, and in no case was a letter not brought before the Board—except anonymous letters—no matter how treacherous the communication might be.

EDWARD.
July 1, 1873;
Mr. F. Stokes.

6614. That statement as to letters not being brought before the Board, you distinctly contradict it—Yes; most distinctly. Such a thing could not be done, because the letters are numbered in rotation, so that unless some one tore letters out, they should come before the Board.

6615. What is the next matter you wish to refer to?—In reference to what he says at question four, in reply to Dr. Norwood, to the effect that we struck a rate three months before we were legally entitled to do so. That is not the case. We had been in the habit of striking a rate on the twenty-fifth of March, and every other Board in the city or county struck on the first of January, and we put ours on the first of January the same as the rest. At the time it gave us a supply of money, but the ratepayers were only called upon to pay the same rate within the same year. Further on he says, in reference to the reception of the deputation, that I was chairman of the Board, and on that occasion they were plainly told by me that they had no right there at all, and that it was only as a matter of courtesy they were there. Well, the grain of truth that there is in that, is that Mr. Shire spoke an unreasonable length of time, and I interrupted him by saying that it was a mere matter of courtesy to hear a discussion on the subject. However, we heard him at great length on totally irrelevant topics, but the members of the Board did not venture to question the right of anyone. We took counsel's opinion as to the question, and it was perfectly correct. At page 203, line four, this question of Leinster-road is brought up. If you think it is convenient I will state the whole question with regard to that here.

6616. CHAIRMAN.—Yes, it would be well to deal with that question now!—In Leinster-road, in the first place, the gradients are very great and the expense of repairing it very small, because the water runs off the whole extent of the Leinster-road. I may say that Leinster-road runs from the Rathmines-road to the Harcourt-cross-road. Well, the matter that has been referred to in reference to Leinster-road arises in this way—

6617. Before you proceed further, I would like to have the maps made for the townships under the Act of 1847 produced!—[Map produced.]

6618. I am right in saying that, up to the year 1873, the Rathmines Commissioners never had maps made under the existing Acts of Parliament?—You are quite mistaken. I can answer the question.

6619. DR. NORWOOD.—We served notice to produce them.

6620. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Johnson says these maps were made within the last six months!—I never saw them before. I was the first chairman under the Act of 1847, and one of the first things I did was to have that map made, and more than that, we had it lithographed and sold to the public. It has been on the wall of the office from that day to this.

6621. MR. CORCORAN.—Was that the map with all the details in the township marked on it?—Oh, no.

6622. CHAIRMAN.—That is what we are talking about. There should be a map, Mr. Stokes, according to the Act of Parliament!—I will go with you there.

6623. And when a new sewer was made it should have been marked upon it!—It should have been done and it was not done.

6624. DR. NORWOOD.—Notice was served on them to produce that map.

6625. CHAIRMAN.—How can they produce what they have not got.

6626. DR. NORWOOD.—If they admit that, that is all I want.

6627. CHAIRMAN.—They have admitted it. Proceed, please, Mr. Stokes. With reference to Leinster-road—the original owner of Leinster-road made it a private road—

6628. When was it made?—About the year 1839. It was made a private road, because at that time nearly all the funerals passed in that direction, there being a

toll on the Circular-road. That was the cause of its being kept a private road, and the only cause.

6629. And was it then maintained by the man who made it?—Yes. He became insolvent, or bankrupt, or something of that sort, and went to the bad, and the road got into very bad order, and in 1853 the Commissioners were applied to to keep it in repair, and they made a contract to keep it in repair for ten years for £30 a year. [Counsel then read part of the contract.]

6630. Was the contract carried out?—Yes. [Counsel then confirmed the reading of the contract.]

WITNESS.—The practical result of that contract was that the township at large received £30 a year for nothing, because they were bound to repair the road if we had taken down the gates. This road is most important in the township, as you will see from my explanation; it is of much greater value than the Rathmines-road, and for the last twenty-five or twenty-six years they have received £30 a year. If the Commissioners threw open the road, we will do so, and we will take back our money. I say "we," as representing the owners. After the contract was made, it was reported to the ratepayers and approved of. It was reported in these terms:—"For an annual payment of £30 for ten years the Commissioners have contracted for the repair of the Leinster-road at the solicitation of the owners of house property thereon." The object of that being to prevent funerals passing there, and for no other reason in the world: and, as to its legality, I do not offer an opinion. It was in every account from 1853 down to 1855, and in 1855 the property was sold in the Landed Estates Court, and we received £400 as compensation for a payment of £30 a year. It appears in the account ending the 25th of March, 1855:—"Owners of Leinster-road for repair of road in perpetuity, see list on other side"—and "list on other side" says—"Per purchases under the Landed Estates Court" (who contributed per rate towards it), "£400," and the money was spent in part payment of the waterworks then in course of construction.

6631. CHAIRMAN.—Is there anything you would wish to add to your evidence?—I think not.

6632. MR. CORCORAN.—Under what contract is the road repaired now?—Under the first contract; it was renewed from time to time.

6633. Is it now in force?—It is.

6634. MR. EAMES.—The twenty years will expire in 1884.

6635. MR. CORCORAN.—Mr. Stokes, do the Commissioners receive £10 a year from some one else?—Yes; £10 a year from the representatives of Thomas Bacon.

6636. What does the road cost you?—Very little; there is a fall of twenty-one feet in a quarter of a mile, so that the expenditure, in the way of repairing, is very small. No doubt, the fact of its being a private road diminishes the cost of repairing, and the fact also of no funerals and stone carts going up there. I have no hesitation in saying that if the Commissioners give up the £30 a year we will give up the road.

6637. CHAIRMAN.—I understand that the objection is to the road being kept as a private road, and as to what right the Town Commissioners have to make any bargain with reference to part of a road?—They took it upon certain terms.

6638. After you took it up what right have you to keep it private; and then I asked whether the houses on the Leinster-road are connected with the main drainage, and I understood the answer to be "We cannot tell, because it is a private road; we have no control over it!"—That is not so; they are all connected with the main drainage. I was the first man who built a house on the road, and I know all about that.

6639. With regard to the legal aspect of the transaction?—I have no doubt it is illegal, but we did it for the advantage of the township.

6640. Has the road been well kept in pursuance of the contract?—It is the most perfectly drained road in the township.

6641. Is it well kept?—Yes.

Dissent.
July 1, 1873
Mr. F. Stokes

6642. And, whether legal or not, the result has been the producing of this £30 a year. And I believe the inhabitants of that place pay rates just the same as any other person!—Yes, they do; and the matter was brought before public meetings, and no objection made to it, even meetings at which Mr. Shire could have been present.

6643. Dr. Norwood.—With reference to the master of the Landed Estates Court, was not that a suggestion of the examiner of the Court!—I believe so; I cannot say of my own knowledge; it is not of any importance. There is a statement on page 203—the first question in the second column—that it was "one of their own friends, Mr. Essex, that was co-opted"; Mr. Essex was not co-opted.

6644. Can you tell us anything about Church-square not being asphaltated?—No; but with regard to the two roads I have mentioned in the course of the evidence of the preceding witness—Windsor road and Maxwell road—we have nothing to do with them; they are private property, and we could not interfere with them.

6645. It was mentioned that those roads were in bad order!—They are not in our charge at all, and I consider that it would be most unjust—in fact a monstrous thing if we were to expend the money of the ratepayers in making roads for other men, who would not pay the expense of putting them into proper order.

6646. But supposing the road becomes in such a state as to be a nuisance!—And we took it up even on that point.

6647. But you need not have done that!—I know that. We went the length of putting a barrier at the end, and putting a "caution" up.

6648. You could have indicted them, and you should have taken some steps; you are the sanitary authority!—No sanitary question arose.

6649. But is it a sanitary nuisance!—Mr. Shire said they were deep with mud, but that is not a sanitary nuisance.

6650. CHAIRMAN.—I think it is a very great nuisance. If mud and filth festers it must become a nuisance!—Anything that men could do was done for those roads. There is a statement made at page 203, in the second column, that Mr. Essex was co-opted; that is not the fact.

6651. He was adopted by the Board!—Yes.

6652. And not opposed to the Board!—Yes, he was one of those instances in which, whenever we saw a man like him receiving a large amount of support, we co-opted him and took him in at the next election. Mr. Shire makes another statement at page 204, second column, question 2. Well, the statement there is substantially correct; although I don't remember having spoken to Mr. Shire, because it is very seldom he would have me on any subject of explanation as this; but what I do say is this; with staff costing £a. or £s. 3d. to remove when it lies there for a day or two, one-half of the wet goes away in water, and it is consequently one-half of the expense to remove, and that, I apprehend, is a saving to the ratepayers; and as for weeks, it never lay there for weeks. Any practical man will know that mud lying there a day or two, or three or four days, the water will run off, and it is, of course, much more economical to remove than.

The next charge is with respect to what Mr. Bradley says about Kenilworth-square. The question is at page 204: he says—"I live in Kenilworth-square; I have frequently sent forward complaints; I have a great deal to complain of." What I wish to refer to is as to Kenilworth-square being private. Mr. Bradley says the Commissioners alleged that it had been taken up. I don't know who made that allegation, but it is utterly without foundation. So far from that I spent a great deal of time in endeavouring to get that square made a public one. Mr. Murphy behaved liberally; he offered a house at £40 a year; and members of the

Board agreed to subscribe the cost of putting it in order; but we were frustrated by some of Mr. Bradley's neighbours who would not agree to its being made public, or pay for its being kept private. There was a clause in Mr. Murphy's lease agreeing to keep it a private square on a contribution of £1 a year. We offered to take it up and repair it under the Public Parks Act, if they would agree to its being made public, because otherwise we could not spend the public money on it. They would not do that. But it never was given up, nor did we ever say that we had taken it up. With regard to the ground it is Mr. Murphy's private property, and he can make drunks and drakes of it.

6653. Mr. Bradley.—I protest against that; he cannot.

6654. WILSON.—I am endeavouring to explain. The place was to be kept unbuilt on as a private garden on payment of £1 a house; but the tenants would not either have it made a public garden or pay the £1 a year. As to the top dressing, I dare say our surveyor was very glad to get rid of the mud.

6655. CHAIRMAN.—It is not a question of public or private at all. The question is simply this—Mr. Bradley stated that he saw with his own eyes, not private carts, but the carts of the Rathmines Town Commissioners, bringing the stuff from the roads and depositing it on that square!

6656. WILSON.—I have no doubt of it.

6657. Isn't that depicting a nuisance in your township?

6658. Mr. Bradley.—It is a nuisance.

6659. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Bradley says it is a most abominable nuisance, and that he smells it with his own nostrils. Does anyone mean to say that the Corporation of Dublin would allow the sweepings stuff of the streets of Dublin to be put on Merrion-square, or Stephen's-green!—I tell you, orders have been made by the police magistrates prohibiting the poor people in town from keeping stuff in their yards for the purpose of making a livelihood of it by selling it to farmers for manure. I was in a place where the sub-sanitary officer had to walk every night in a foot deep of human filth, and when he was called on to explain it he said it did not do him any harm.

6660. Mr. Bradley.—One of the Commissioners told me himself that he complained to Mr. Murphy of it, and his reply was that if he did not put it in the road staff there he would put it in something worse.

6661. Mr. Stokes.—We are not accountable if the law is with Mr. Murphy.

6662. CHAIRMAN.—You are not, but say you not accountable for allowing your own carts to draw it up there.

6663. Mr. Bradley.—I ask him to produce my letters.

6664. WILSON.—I was not there last summer; but my impression is, that it was brought before me as charming, and that I ordered it to be stopped.

6665. Mr. Bradley.—I had a letter from the Commissioner, stating that no manorial staff would be put on. Last summer the same proceeding was adopted, and was complained of again, and I got a letter from Mr. Evans informing me that the Commissioners would not interfere.

6666. CHAIRMAN.—The gist of the complaint is that the staff was not only put there, but that the Commissioners' carts were actually employed to draw it.

6667. Mr. Bradley.—They are.

6668. CHAIRMAN.—That is, Mr. Murphy, I suppose, gets it put there for nothing.

6669. WILSON.—A person said the material was top-dressing.

6670. CHAIRMAN.—I don't care whether it is or not. I don't see what right Mr. Murphy has to get it started in the carts of the Town Commissioners, which are the property of the rate payer, without, as far as I know, his paying anything for it. If it be valuable as manure for top dressing his square, it must be equally valuable to be sent out to Milltown, and sold there.

6671. Mr. Bradley.—Some of the Commissioners

DURHAM,
July 1, 1878.
Mr. F. Stokes.

told me that it was for the purpose of saving the carting elsewhere, that they put it there.

6665. Mr. Monckton.—Would not that be legitimate?

Mr. Bradley.—No it is not. It is a nuisance at my house, and I protest against it.

6666. Mr. Measom.—I was not talking Mr. Stokes about that at all. (*To witness*) All you can tell us is that this square, has not been taken up by the Commissioners under the circumstances you stated!

Witness.—Yes, statements have been made by every one of the witnesses with respect to what I see is called the "Canal interest." One gentleman has been kind enough to call it the "Canal ring." I will take that topic in the first place. The contracts with the canal were made chiefly by me, and I desire to say that the statement that there is a canal interest or "canal ring" which means a gang of scoundrels, par amount at the board, has not the slightest shadow of foundation. I will first meet the only definite charge that has been made, because it has been made against a gentleman who had not the power of defending himself. It was stated, and repeated again and again, that Mr. Evans was largely interested in the canal, and the imputation was thrown out directly and broadly that he favoured the canal because he was pecuniarily interested in it.

6668. CHAIRMAN.—I certainly don't recollect the name of any individual being mentioned.

Witness.—It was in the public prints.

6669. CHAIRMAN.—If it was, they could not have taken it down here.

Witness.—Possibly not here; but it was certainly stated in the public prints.

6670. Dr. Newbold.—I did not hear any one's name mentioned.

Witness.—It was stated in a letter of Mr. Bentley to the newspaper.

6671. CHAIRMAN.—I won't go into that. The charge is that a number of Town Commissioners were interested in the canal.

6672. Mr. Monckton.—The suggestion is obvious. (*To witness*) Tell me how that stands.

Witness.—There are only two names on the list of Commissioners who are shareholders in the canal namely Mr. John H. Evans, who is joined with Mr. Henry Tindal Atkinson. The history of that shows the extent to which the imputation is justified. This sum of £10,000, was part of the fortune settled upon my daughter when she married, it belonged to Mr. McDowell, her husband's father. There was £20,000 settled on her and this in £10,000 of it. It was handed over to them as trustees; and it must have been quite obvious to every fair man in the community that when it was put in two names, it was a trust estate. Both the children were brought up in the same Sunday school, of which Mr. Evans was Superintendent, and it was a most natural thing that he should be their trustee. That is the explanation of that £10,000.

6673. Mr. Monckton.—He is a mere trustee, and has no interest in the money!—No interest whatever. The only other name is that of William Todd.

6674. I see another sum of £200!—That is also trust money. I suppose I need not vindicate him. Up to yesterday I did not know even that there was one. I would like to add that the entire payment by the Commissioners to the Grand Canal Company is about £300 a year, out of a total income of £20,000, so that there is not the slightest ground for saying that any canal interest has weighed with the Commissioners. The next charge is that "Mr. Stokes was working heaven and earth to bring up electors;" and, further on, Mr. Henry Browne, in his evidence, says, that "Mr. Stokes stopped in the room where the balloting was going on, and had to be told that he should not stay there." "The very appearance of Mr. Stokes as chairman"—it is said—"was an interference." Well, of course, I cannot be accountable for my appearance, but there is not a single syllable

of truth in that statement from beginning to end. No such occurrence ever took place or anything like it. What did take place was this. The passage into the balloting room was through the Commissioners' office, and I placed the two collectors in the Commissioners' office, to afford information to all parties. I spoke to the leader of the opposition, Mr. Bagull, and offered him the privilege, or the option of having two or three of their people there to see who passed through, and to take the names; which they accepted thankfully. Subsequently they objected to my remaining in my own office, and I left it, and the office was kept clear the whole day. But I never stepped in the balloting room. That would be an indecent offence. I went in once or twice with Mr. Bagull to settle small points in the case, but to say that I interfered in the election is untrue from beginning to end. There is a statement that "the carriages of Commissioners were bringing up voters." There was nothing to prevent the carriages of the Commissioners from bringing up voters, but nothing of the kind ever took place. I might have had my carriage there to have fished up voters, but, as to my organised system, nothing of the kind ever took place to my knowledge.

6675. I see Mr. Henry Browne is one of the gentlemen who says that we cannot have a proper representation of public opinion as long as the Commissioners have a large financial interest vested in the canal!—Nearly every witness who comes up has a dad at the canal.

6676. Well, we have disposed of the canal!—I hope so.

6677. Your statement is that the account of what took place at the election is untrue!—Ah, well, we won't use any offensive word, but it is untrue at any rate. I say emphatically—and I challenge contradiction—that I simply intended during the day to see fair play. I never interfered with a single voter, or asked him how he voted, or sought his vote. Of course I had my own inclinations. We always supported the outgoing Commissioners—whether they had been put in by the Board or by the public they had equal support.

6678. CHAIRMAN.—The charge is that the Board themselvesominated and worked for the outgoing men, and used all their influence through the township to have their nominees elected!—It is not true. The Board never interfere as a body. Individual members interfered. We never were unanimous. There were always one or two dissentients. But undoubtedly, we all worked as hard as we could for the outgoing numbers—no doubt about it. Every other board does the same. I want to say something about the officers, because they have been unhandily accused.

6679. Mr. Measom.—There were a certain number of Commissioners whose candidates the Board favoured, while others were brought in—to use a familiar expression—or their own book, by the township!—Yes, by the popular vote.

6680. Can you tell us what proportion of Commissioners have been brought in in that way!—I could.

6681. CHAIRMAN.—Is there such a thing going on as an arrangement between members of the Board themselves as to whom they will let in, or what seats they will reserve for individuals!—None whatever.

6682. You never heard of such a thing!—Never. If you will allow me I will tell you what did happen, for, if anybody is accountable for it, I am. What we generally do is this. When we fill up a vacancy we discuss amongst ourselves, after the Board has broken up, who should take the next vacancy, so that when a vacancy happens we may have a man ready, so as not to have one thrust in at the spur of the moment.

6683. Tell me is there any foundation for this. The question was put to a gentleman, whom I won't name at present—"Are you satisfied with the representa-

DUNDEE,
Aug. 1, 1921
Mr. F. Stokes

sion of the Commissioners and their management of the township!—I think it is excellent, I think there is an amount of liberality on the Board that is practised nowhere else. For instance, the majority of the members are men with large holdings, but there are always a certain number of seats reserved for gentlemen who have no interest in the township beyond the houses they occupy or pay a rack-rent for. It has always been considered fair to the occupiers that they should have representation." Then I asked this question—"How do you mean that there are a certain number of seats reserved?" The answer is—"We always admitted that there should be so many, some three or four, that had not actually any property in the township, but should represent the occupiers." Then I put the question, "And so they are elected?"—"Yes, and we often co-opt." "But that is only in case of vacancy?"—"Yes, and they have always been retained by the ratepayers." "As a rule, do the ratepayers elect the members proposed by the Board?"—"Yes, almost everything the Commissioners do in fact." Is there any foundation for that statement?—Which statement?

6684. I will read it for you again—"I think there is an amount of liberality in the Board that is perhaps practised nowhere else. For instance, the majority of the members are men with large holdings, but there is always a certain amount of seats reserved—that is reserved by the Board—"for gentlemen who have no interest in the township but the houses they occupy and pay a rack-rent for. It is always considered—that is considered by the Board—"fair that the occupiers should have representation!"—Yes, that part I concur in, but as to the number of seats being left it is a mistake.

6685. I asked the question—"How do you mean that a certain number of seats are reserved?"—"We always admit"—that is the Board—"that there should be so many, three or four, that have not any property in the township, who should represent the occupiers." The Board admits that, do you see. Then comes the question—"And so they are elected?"—Yes, we often co-opt." I put the question—"That is in case of a vacancy?" The answer is, "Yes." "And they are always retained by the ratepayers?"—As a rule, the ratepayers elect the members who are proposed by the Board?" The answer is—"Yes, almost everything the Commissioners do in fact." Now, do you agree with the gentleman, a member of your Board, who stated that?—I don't agree with him in the statement as to three or four—that is, the statement from which it would appear that the matter was arranged at the Board, and that they parcelled out amongst themselves how many outsiders they would allow to be elected, and how many not. I think Mr. Murphy is probably confounding two things. We always endeavoured to reserve a certain number of seats for Roman Catholics.

6686. Oh, not at all. I will show you that he contradicts that!—He is wrong.

6687. CHAIRMAN.—I will read you his evidence:—"Mr. Stokes does not take the same view in one respect!" And then his answer is—"If Mr. Stokes were here we could argue it to your satisfaction that what I say is quite right." Then I ask the question was put before the Parliamentary Committee—"The Board were anxious to get Roman Catholics, and they co-opted them, but they were generally thrown out on re-election." And Mr. Murphy says—"That is an extraordinary statement for a Commissioner to make, and I will tell you how exactly the real facts are. At the last election—there is a small knot of malcontents everywhere, and we have a few in the township—they wanted to get out the whole Board, and it so happened that there were three Roman Catholics at the Board, and the Board were annoyed at the hostility shown, but every one of the members was returned. The anxiety of the Board is to keep a number of Roman Catholics on the Board; we have two or three very respectable Roman Catholics, and

our present chairman is a Catholic. We have had three chairmen up to the present, and two of them have been Roman Catholics. Although Rathmines is very far from Liberal, the facts as to the Board are—I have stated them, and it is a shame for any one to make the statement you have mentioned."

6688. CHAIRMAN.—From Mr. Murphy's statement it would appear as if there had been in your own room a conference on the subject, and that it was stated how many seats should be thrown open to the public—is that so!—No. I can not account for what Mr. Murphy says. He is entirely inaccurate there, because there have been five instead of three.

6689. If that is the feeling of the township you can hardly blame the people for saying it is in the hands of the Commissioners entirely; and Mr. Murphy appears to think that any who quarrelled with that are a lot of malcontents—that's what he calls them.

WIMBLEDON.—I don't shrink from stating that of course we try to get the best men we can.

6690. MR. MORSESON.—No doubt they try to get the best men.

6691. CHAIRMAN.—The witness has stated that there was not the slightest management. I have read for you Mr. Murphy's evidence at page 54, where he states that whenever you have a contest the Roman Catholics and Liberals have generally been excluded; and you answered that sometimes they were successful because they were always supported by the Board.

WIMBLEDON.—Yes; I stick to that. I stick to that. In fact a Roman Catholic could not get in unless he was supported by the Board as a rule.

6692. "There were originally six Roman Catholics," you say, "but when there was a contest the Roman Catholic went to the wall and we replaced them according as we had the opportunity!"—I stick to that.

6693. But you see he says——!—I don't care what he says.

6694. He says it was a chance for anyone to make a statement of the kind!—Well perhaps he does not like to consider that he is one of the minority. (To Mr. MORSESON.) What is the question you asked before this discussion?

6695. MR. MORSESON.—The question I was going to ask was this. We all know that there are certain candidates who are favoured by the Board, and certain other candidates whom we may describe as "outside us," to use an expression of the Board. Tell me what are the proportions of each!—The first name is Samuel Bolton, I opposed his being co-opted, to my great regret. He was elected by the ratepayers and supported by us. Mr. Carey was elected against the Board list, and he has been supported by the Board ever since. Mr. Eason—you have already heard his story—stood and was beaten and we adopted him. Mr. Plaintiff tried twice and was beaten, and we co-opted him and supported his return when it was afterwards contested. He is a Roman Catholic. Mr. Shackleton was returned against the Board list. Dr. Ward in the same way.

6696. What do you mean by the Board list?—The outgoing members of the Board.

6697. But that is not like the list at a club where you put down that they are recommended by the Board!—But that was never done.

6698. But you are using very unfortunate expressions, which are going down on the notes. You are saying "supported by the board" and "board list"!—When I say "board" I mean the members of the board. When I say "board list" I mean the outgoing members.

6699. MR. MORSESON.—Listen to my question. We understand that there are actually in the present constitution of the board a certain number of members that we might call "board's members"—if I may use such a phrase—and certain other members elected by the ratepayers against the wishes of the Board!—Yes.

6700. What proportion of the Board, as it now

DENBIGH
July 1, 1891.
Mr. F. Stokes.

exists, were originally brought in by the ratepayers against the wishes of the Board!—Five.

6701. Dr. Norwood.—In how many years?

Witness.—A good many have come out, and gone in, and come out again.

6702. Are you speaking of the present list?—There are five; but I must correct that by saying that every member of the present Board has been elected by the ratepayers.

6703. Mr. Monahan.—We are all aware that they were elected, and that there are no ex-opted members.

Witness.—I believe so. I am not quite sure. At any rate there are five members of the Board at present who were elected in the first instance in opposition to the outgoing candidates—I use that phrase to meet objections.

6704. Mr. Monahan.—I am not aware that there is anything else I have to ask.

Witness.—It has been made an imputation on the officers that the official staff were used. I don't mean to say that the officers felt no interest in the election; but as to interfering in support of people they never did. The exercise is at perfect liberty, if he chooses, to interfere; but he never did so, or scarcely at all. You must bear in mind that either of those gentlemen has more interest than, perhaps, the whole of the opposition candidates put together, so that they could not be expected to be neutral; but as to abusing their position there is no truth in it. I don't know whether or not this is the proper time to hand in a statement which I prepared. Not expecting to be here before the Board met, I prepared a statement on various points that I thought would come up, but, of course, not in any way referring to the evidence which has been taken; and if the Commissioners think it right to accept it as evidence, I will hand it in. If not, Mr. Monahan had better question me through it. Perhaps it would save time to hand it in.

6705. CHAIRMAN.—We will put it in the appendix.

6706. Dr. Norwood.—Allow me to have a copy.

6707. Mr. Monahan.—Perhaps it will answer every purpose if it is printed.

Witness.—I will be happy, at any hour of the day, to answer any other question.

6708. CHAIRMAN, having looked at the document, said.—Mr. Stokes was good enough to send this on the 5th of April, 1891, to the Baltimore Commissioners, and it is rather hard that a copy of it was not given to us last May. It is dated the 5th of April, 1891, and it is certainly hardly fair to put it in now when you had it long ago. In course of post it came here on the 5th of April, and we sat on the 7th.

6709. Dr. Norwood.—Permit me to add, on behalf of my clients, that, though they were in communication with the Baltimore Commissioners as far back as the 5th of May, it was never sent to them with the other documents.

Witness.—I think it ought to have been handed in the first instance.

6710. CHAIRMAN (to witness).—You sent it once, knowing that we were to sit on the 7th of April?

Witness.—I did.

6711. CHAIRMAN.—We sat on the 7th of April, and adjourned until the 19th of May, and sat for a week, and we never heard of it until now.

6712. Mr. Monahan.—I am at a loss to know what to do with it.

Witness.—It is like what an exceedingly clever lawyer would do.

6713. CHAIRMAN.—I will call attention in the report to the fact that though they have had it in their possession since the 7th of April, they have never produced it. The curiosity of the matter is, that it is addressed to the Boundaries Commissioners, but we never heard of it until this moment. I am very sorry, Mr. Stokes, that you did not send it to us long ago, there is a great deal of most valuable matter in it which would have been very good in my hands for asking questions about.

Witness.—I suppose the truth is, Counsel wanted to make use of it.

6714. Dr. Norwood.—Permit me to say that the ratepayers of Baltimore, whose interests are vitally affected by this inquiry, ought to have had an opportunity of seeing this statement.

6715. Alderman Harris.—This is not a statement of facts; it is an essay of Mr. Stokes' own.

6716. CHAIRMAN.—It is a statement of his views.

Witness.—Nothing more; but I am prepared to swear to it.

6717. CHAIRMAN.—If he had sent it to us we would have given you an ample opportunity of answering it. I will put it in now and say that it was kept back until the last moment.

6718. Mr. Monahan.—It was not handed in by us.

6719. CHAIRMAN.—Surely Mr. Evans had it. It was not sent over printed. It was sent over in manuscript by Mr. Stokes, and though it is addressed to us it was printed at the expense of the Baltimore Commissioners. By the very envelope in which it is now handed to us, it appears that it comes from the office of the Baltimore Commissioners, and that they got it printed.

6720. Mr. Bradley.—At the expense of the ratepayers.

6721. CHAIRMAN.—We could have got it printed at Thorn's.

6722. Mr. Monahan.—I was told that it was considered right by the former Counsel to hand it in at the end of Mr. Stokes' evidence, as embodying that evidence.

6723. CHAIRMAN.—How were Counsel to know that Mr. Stokes was to be examined at all, or that we would have adjourned?

6724. Alderman Harris.—Will you let it go into the appendix as an *ex parte* statement?

6725. CHAIRMAN.—It will go in as a statement of Mr. Stokes' views, but the circumstances under which it was handed in to day will be mentioned.

6726. Alderman Harris.—It is a series of attacks on the Corporation which we have no means of refuting.

6727. CHAIRMAN.—But you have a series of attacks on them. I don't know whether this document is going to the public or not. I am not going to give it to the public; if the Baltimore Commissioners choose to do so I cannot help them.

Witness.—I am bound to say that there is a great deal of justice in what Dr. Norwood has said, but it was not my fault that Mr. Evans's fault. I sent it to Mr. Evans in time, and he put it into the hands of Counsel.

6728. Mr. ELLIOTT.—I am sorry you did not send it to Mr. Cotton and me.

Witness.—I wish I had. I don't like those very clever things.

6729. CHAIRMAN.—I am satisfied it is not Mr. Fitzgerald's fault.

Witness.—It was in the hands of Counsel for the Commissioners on the very first day. It was not Mr. Fitzgerald's fault.

6730. Mr. Monahan.—Personally I am not to blame in the matter, for I was not here.

6731. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Stokes, in your examination before the Committee of the House of Commons, you were asked, in question 3145—

"Do you think it facilitates the despatch of business to allow a political discussion?—and your answer is—'Of course it does. The hour of meeting is nine o'clock sharp, and we are never excepted in that respect. No business is brought on after ten o'clock, and I need not tell you that with only one hour a day for business, we must look sharp, and have no speaking or waste of time, because at ten o'clock any gentleman can go, because he knows with certainty that no business can be entered upon after he has gone.'"

Is that correct?—You must read that as "no new business."

6732. But with that qualification it is correct?—No new business—that is, no business that is not on the list. The routine business is gone on with, afterwards, but there can be no name sprung after men have gone.

DEBATES
July 1, 1878.
Mr. F. Stokes

6733. Anything that is on the list can be gone on with afterwards!—Oh, yes. We sit long after ten o'clock; but men can go away at that hour with the certain knowledge that no notice of motion can be brought on after that hour.

6734. Even though it is on the book!—Not even a notice of motion that is on the books; so that a man who is pressed for time can go away at ten o'clock.

6735. And if there be anything under discussion you stop!—No; we go on.

6736. You finish the subject, and take up no new notices of motion after that!—No.

6737. Mr. CORROX.—Even if it be set down for that day!—No. In point of fact we never have any notices of motion.

6738. CHAIRMAN.—Everything on the list for that day is gone through, but no new business—that is, no business not noticed in the day's list—will be gone into!—That is so; but every thing on the list is gone through. The list is laid before me, and we go through it from beginning to end.

6739. What do you call "new business"—do you mean business that has not been discussed up to ten o'clock!—That a man did not know was coming forward.

6740. Suppose there are six notices of motion!—There is a difficulty there, because we never have notices of motion.

6741. Suppose there were six matters for discussion on the list!—We go through them.

6742. The whole list!—Yes.

6743. But suppose you have not time!—Oh, well, we would stay until we finished them; and a man would know what was going on, and if he chose to go away he would go away with his eyes open.

6744. Your next answer goes against that, you know—the answer in reply to the Attorney-General's question—"They would only consider what business was in hand, I suppose!"—to which you reply—"Yes, and routine matters"?—That would include all that is on the paper—the business in hand would include all that is on the paper.

6745. In the Pembroke Township they meet twice a month, and stay generally two hours and a half to do their business, independently of the work done by their roads and sanitary committees. Do you think that one hour is enough in Rathmines!—About two hours we stay. We tried it every way. We tried meetings every fortnight, every three weeks, and every month, and we found that meetings every month were the most convenient. I should say this in addition, that I attended every meeting—sometimes twice a day—while I was chairman, for nearly twenty years, to receive anyone that was there, and to dispatch any matters of detail. I was generally there in the evenings at ten o'clock, and in the afternoons at three.

6746. Do you think the sanitary staff of Rathmines sufficient!—Hardly.

6747. The eight men and the hall porter!—Well, they have been ringing the changes a good deal on the hall porter. He has to keep the hall, but has very little else to do. Oh, well, it is not sufficient.

6748. Is there no one there but the hall porter!—His wife is there.

6749. You are bound to have your maps for any person who requires them to take copies of or examine them, and therefore you should have Mr. Evans or the hall porter there!—Yes; but nobody ever does come.

6750. No one does come!—During the whole thirty years that I was there I don't suppose that half a dozen persons came.

6751. Mr. MORSEAU.—Besides the monthly meetings there are committee meetings!—Oh, yes; that has been referred to.

6752. With reference to the attendance to show maps and give information to the public, I believe Mr. Evans has an assistant!—Yes. Mr. Evans and he make arrangements between them as far as that goes.

6753. CHAIRMAN.—He is not paid by the Commissioners!—Practically he is paid by the township. Mr.

Evans's salary was increased for the purpose of paying him. I wish to mention that while in other townships the landlords have the power of voting, in Rathmines they have none. In Kingstown every owner of a house rated at £50 a year has a vote, but the landlords of Rathmines are wholly unrepresented as such, but they have the best representation, because if they are Town Commissioners they are returned only by the rate-payers, not by the landlords. A good deal has been placed on landlord influence. They have no direct influence. It is indirect.

6754. It has been said that they are the persons interested in increasing or lessening taxation!—They are the most proper persons to be Commissioners, in my opinion—I doubt about it. I don't think my opinion a bit. Others are birds of passage who are there today and gone to-morrow. I would have them all property holders if I had the chance.

6755. You never have a higher rate than 2s in Rathmines. In Pembroke township they have a 3s 6d. rate, and they say it is not enough!—I consider that our management is as superior to that of Pembroke Commissioners as theirs is to that of the Corporation—we will put it that way. But we are not in the same position as Pembroke township, which has a dominant owner of property who puts his hand into his pocket whenever anything comes short. We have no such person.

Cross-examined.

6756. Dr. MORSEAU.—Do you know what the pressure of water is at Rathgar!—No.

6757. Did you ever hear any complaints of the pressure being insufficient in that district!—Oh, yes; the waterworks were originally planned for the service of Rathmines only, and of course there was some degree of difficulty in applying them to Rathgar, which was subsequently annexed.

6758. I believe Rathgar is a well built-on, and respectable district!—Yes.

6759. Have you heard that it has been given in evidence that the water is shut off in that district from nine o'clock in the evening until half past six in the morning!—I saw it in evidence. It is very generally the case. It is done in Kingstown and Pembroke townships.

6760. CHAIRMAN.—No, it is never turned off in Pembroke township.

Wilson.—It is not now perhaps.

6761. Dr. MORSEAU (to witness).—Are you aware that the Water Commissioners Clauses Act is included in your Act of Parliament!—Part of it.

6762. And that you are bound by it!—To some of the clauses, not to the whole.

6763. Are you aware that there is a clause making it illegal to shut off water from a district!—I cannot answer that question. I think it is probable, I am not a lawyer.

6764. What is the condition of your fire brigade?—We have no fire brigade. As that question, Mr Chairman, has been hammered on, allow me to say a few words. We have no power to have a fire brigade—no power whatever.

6765. That is not the first time that you have made the statement that you have no power to have a fire brigade. Allow me to read a letter of yours to the ratepayers in which you made that statement. Do you recollect it!—Read it to me and I will tell you.

6766. That you had no legal power to establish a fire brigade—do you remember!—Yes—at least I remember my statement. Anyone else I won't answer for.

6767. Do you think it right to allow a district in which it has been stated that there are upwards of 1,000 inhabited houses to remain without a drop of water from nine o'clock at night until half past six in the morning!—It is undesirable, but if we have not the water we cannot give it to them.

6768. Do you know Mr. Magee!—Yes.

6769. Is it a fact that there is a forge yard behind

DODGE,
July 1, 1879.
Mr. F. Stokes.

his large stores!—How can I answer as to what is behind his stores?

6770. Is he not a contractor—a man who has a forge yard?—I don't know—very likely.

6771. And has he not stated that the district is left without the slightest protection against fire during the night?—No doubt if the water is cut off there would be a delay in getting it turned on again.

6772. Is it a true statement that has been made in a letter to the Commissioners by Mr. O'Rourke that he has been refused a water supply unless he paid £17 for having pipes put down on a public road?—I have no knowledge of it.

6773. Is it true?—I don't know. I think there must be some other explanation.

6774. Perhaps the Commissioners have his letter?—Our rule was that where a man required a main in a road which was not previously our property, he should pay one-third of the cost. Possibly that was the explanation.

6775. Mr. O'Rourke states that there were several houses on the road and that he was refused the water unless he paid £17?—Very likely, if it was not a public road.

6776. He stated that it was a public road?—I cannot tell you.

6777. You stated in the House of Commons, that very few complaints reached the Commissioners?—I did.

6778. Is it a fact, that the water supply was frequently the subject of complaints?—Oh yes; since the place got so much built on, there have been a good many complaints from the upper districts.

6779. You state that your Commissioners needed to the request for a public audit. Allow me to call your attention to your circular in which, addressing the ratepayers, you repudiate a public audit as being unnecessary and impractical?—Give me the words and I will tell you whether they are mine or not.

6780. Under the date, "3rd of September, 1873, Commercial Buildings," this is a letter addressed to the ratepayers of Bathmills, by Frederick Stokes. It is on the subject of the elections, and you say—

"GENTLEMEN.—As one who has given his best powers to your service for thirty years, I claim permission to put a few inquiries to you, before you exercise your franchise on the present occasion. I gather from Messrs. Ward and Young's circular there gravamen, namely, that we do not repair the roads, that we do not admit the Press, and that we have not pleased ourselves under the Local Government Board. With regard to the point I am particularly asking you about, you say this.—As it is the audit, do the managers really desire to subordinate self-government, and place their transaction under the red tape and costly routine of the Local Government Board, impeding the conduct of business without the slightest advantage? Can you not select two honest and able men from amongst yourselves to audit the accounts? Is there a suggestion that the past auditors for twenty-six years, have been other than honest and able? Every item of every one of those twenty-six accounts, has passed under my careful revision, and I ask any ratepayer, to put his hand on a single figure that he can honestly object to, or that shows unaccuracy or negligence. The resolution of Messrs. Ward and Young's is generalised by the retiring Commissioners, is so complete, that it only needs for me to say, that it is strictly correct."

Did you not, on the part of the Commissioners, decline a public audit on that occasion?—What I said, I am prepared to stick to still. Those were my sentiments, and they have not changed.

6781. Did you state before the Committee of the House of Commons, that the public Auditor prevented matters that were illegal, but that might be expedient, from being done?—Yes, and I say so still.

6782. Who appointed the auditors?—The ratepayers.

6783. Upon what occasions?—At the annual public meeting.

6784. How many persons attend at these annual public meetings?—Generally very few.

6785. How many on an average?—Oh, I could not give you the average. It was very rare to have half a dozen.

6786. None at all sometimes!—None at all sometimes.

6787. Who appointed them then?—I did. The Act of Parliament is, that when there is no one at the public meeting to appoint them, the chairman was to nominate them, and I did so. There was a contest on only one occasion, when they put out Mr. Costigan because he was a Roman Catholic.

6788. Did you ever hear any complaints in Bathmills about the preferential payment of taxes by the landlords?—I don't understand your question.

6789. I believe, according to the Act of Parliament, both moieties must be paid before the 31st of August, to entitle the occupier to vote?—Yes; that was one of the reasons why we altered the payment of the rates. When it was in March and September, that disqualified nearly every one in the township.

6790. And thus narrowed the constituency. How many houses are there in the township?—About 3,000.

6791. And there are about 1,200 persons on the roll of electors?—Well, you forget that there are 700 women, who have not the right of voting.

6792. Was the complaint made, that the landlords did not pay the taxes in order to disqualify occupiers?—I don't believe a word of it. I heard it used, but I believe it to be utterly untrue—that is, that it was done designately. As a rule, the landlords paid a great deal better than the tenants.

6793. With regard to the Board electing their members, you say, at question 2850, that the Board make a point of putting a Roman Catholic, but that there are very few eligible in the neighbourhood?—Well, I think you have not read the whole question. When there was a Roman Catholic vacancy—

6794. What do you mean by that?—When a Roman Catholic went out we endeavoured to supply his place by one of the same faith.

6795. You say in answer to question 2850—"When a Roman Catholic goes out we make a point of putting a Roman Catholic in his place." When do you mean by "we"?—The Board—the co-opters. When we were originally promoting our Act, an agreement was made with some of those who opposed it that there should be twelve Protestants and six Roman Catholics, and the original Commissioners were in that proportion, but we never were able to keep the six in. They were turned out nearly every time.

6796. Have you heard complaints in Bathmills, about the principle of co-option?—Never that I knew of.

6797. About the way the Board acted?—In what respect?

6798. About co-opting members?—No. I never heard any complaints.

6799. Did you never read any of the circulars?—Oh yes, if you mean, those of the candidates. I don't mind what they say.

6800. Then you did hear complaints?—Of course a candidate makes the best case he can.

6801. Was it a fact that the officers of the Board addressed those circulars touching the election?—At the last election, one of the collectors addressed some of them and was paid for it.

6802. Was the outgoing numbers?—Yes.

6803. And that was done in the office of the Commissioners?—I don't know where it was done—whether he took them home or not.

6804. Would you be surprised to learn that it was done in the Commissioners' office?—Not a bit. I should not have objected. He might have directed them for the opposition if he liked.

6805. Did you invariably issue circulars when there was a contested election, on behalf of the outgoing Commissioners?—No, I think not. There was no rule. It was not the rule, but I have three or four of ours here. If there was what you call a jolly shindy, we did; but if there was only a sham opposition, we did not.

6806. Then you did issue them?—Oh yes, whenever I thought it would be of any good.

6807. CHAIRMAN.—It is perfectly plain that Mr. Stokes was under the impression that the notabilities of the Board would be the men most likely to get in.

Witness.—Still, anyone that was returned in opposition to our wishes, we always supported. As I said before, we found them very jolly fellows when they came in, however upstartish they were when they were not elected.

6808. Dr. Norwood.—You mesmerized them!—We did, and they got satisfied.

6809. Do you ever recollect anyone bringing under the notice of the Commissioners the necessity of having those maps made before last year?—You mean the sewer map?

6810. Yes, for the whole township!—Oh, indeed I spoke often enough about it myself. It should have been done long ago.

6811. Mr. Bolton was under the impression that the thing was done!—There was a map, but it was not a map of the sewers.

6812. He says there was a map constructed from time to time, occasionally as was required. I should like to see any map showing what was done!—I may just as well say at once, that there is no defiance on that point.

6813. I would have thought that intending bailiffs would want to know how the sewers ran in the streets!—Well, we could give them that; but there was no such map made as ought to have been made.

6814. Did you in a circular "earnestly impress on everyone interested in the township the necessity of using a little caution to bring up voters on behalf of the Board"?—I never published any circular on behalf of the Board, I always stood on my own bottom from that day to that.

6815. When you say that the sewerage is perfect in Ruthin, how did you come to the knowledge that that was so if you had not a map of the sewers?—I got a map in the early stages of my chairmanship, showing all the sewers to be made—a very nice map—and giving in detail all the works required, we did that by '66.

6816. Do you know that evidence has been given here to show that a large number of houses in the township are unconnected with main sewers?—Yes, I saw that.

6817. And that there are a large number of cesspools!—I never heard of cesspools in the township. I don't say that they are not there. Unquestionably there are houses not connected with sewers, because, short of a proscription, we could not get them to do it.

6818. Do you think that a township like yours should have the undivided services of your surveyor?—Well, I think it ought now, from its magnitude. It is three times as large as when he was first appointed.

6819. Is it not inconvenient to have a public surveyor working for private parties in the township?—I don't care what salary you give the surveyor; he will work for private parties. They will all do it. If you were to give him a thousand a year you could not prevent it.

6820. Are you aware that Mr. Vernon has stated that the undivided time of the surveyor is given in Penllyn township?—No, I did not see that.

6821. He stated so, and that the undivided time of Mr. Neville is given in the city?—I cannot answer the question in either case.

6822. Is it desirable that he should be discharging duties for members of the Board when he ought to be attending to the business of the township?—That is begging the question. There is no objection to his working for members of the Board no more than for any other person, but if he neglects his duties to the township that is another question. I don't see any objection to his working for members of the Board if he is in business for himself. Otherwise we should have to give a very much larger salary.

6823. What do you pay Mr. Johnson?—I think his salary was £300 a year when I was at the Board,

but I believe it has been raised since. The only mistake I made was to let them off too sharp. If we had levied £1 in the pound more we could have got rid of all these difficulties, but I had a pride in keeping the taxation down to 2s. I see now that it was a mistake.

6824. Do you know how many members of the Board were owners of property when the agreement was made about Leinster-road?—Owners of what property?

6825. Along Leinster-road, and were members of the Board at the time the agreement was made about which we have heard?—Define what you mean—owners of land or of houses.

6826. Owners of houses, who were members of the Board!

I could not tell you: perhaps five or six.

6827. Were there seven?—Their names will tell you. There were a good many at that time. I don't think there are any now at all.

6828. And two of your officers were also!—I think there are only two or three now. If there is a point to be made on that I should say that all the owners of houses on the road were entitled by the agreement with the head landlord, to have the road kept in repair by him. They had no interest in keeping the road in repair, except that it should be done by somebody.

6829. Does that include lighting—the sum paid by those people under that contract?—Oh, we light all the roads, public and private.

6830. Did you ever hear any complaints with regard to the public lighting?—How do you mean—as to the quality or the quantity?

6831. With regard to the period at which the roads are lit, and the number of lamps?—I never heard complaints as to the period at which the roads are lit. When winter comes there is always a scramble for lamps.

6832. The lamps are shut off invariably about twelve o'clock?—No; in the winter time at three, and in the summer at ten.

6833. I notice complaints here, that in 1873 they shut off the lamps at twelve o'clock!—The case may be so.

6834. Is it a fact, as a gentleman has stated, that the only light on the road from Portobello-bridge to Ruthgar is the light at Hamilton and Leigh's surgery?—I don't believe it, whoever says it, unless you give me the time.

6835. Between eleven and twelve o'clock?—No.

6836. Are you satisfied of that?—No; it was after dinner, and did not know what the time was.

6837. Was Mr. Helton a member of the Board in 1876?—I cannot say; I think he died before that.

6838. Was he co-opted after having been rejected by the ratepayers?—He was.

6839. Is that his name in the list of Canal Stock owners—just turn to letter "H"?—That's his name.

6840. He is another canal shareholder on the Board, in addition to those you have mentioned!—I cannot say that. I don't know if he was a member of the Board at that time.

6841. Was he ever a member of the Board?—Oh, yes. (To Mr. Evans.)—When did Mr. Helton die?—In the spring of 1876.

6842. Dr. Norwood.—Then it is a fact that he was a member of the Board, and also the owner of Canal Stock.

Witness.—Mr. Helton was not a member of the Board when the contract was made.

6843. But he was when the discussion took place, after Mr. Leonard recommended you to take the Varley!—He was—at least if the date given to me is correct.

6844. The 12th February, 1876. August, 1876, was the time when the Varley supply was discussed! He died the spring of 1876. (Document produced.) Now this is what I consider discreditable. Mr. John Stithers is in this list, in connection with Mr. Cannon.

DEBATES.
July 11, 1879.
Mr. F. Stokes.

DURHAM,
July 1, 1892.
Mr. F. Stokes.

for £150. Is it not manifest that that is a trust?

6845. A great many sub-committees meet from time to time to transact business—when do they meet?—Right off-hand.

6846. Did you not say that you yourself attended day by day, the Commissioners having great confidence in your rulings?—Yes; there is a finance committee, an audit committee, and a water committee.

6847. How often do the finance committee meet?—Every month.

6848. And the audit committee?—Every month also. The water committee meet less frequently.

6849. How often do the water committee meet?—Whenever there is any occasion.

6850. Do they meet five times in the year?—I could not say.

Examined by the Rev. Mr. Shire.

6851. Mr. Stokes states that my letter to him presenting the first memorial was addressed to him as an individual. I never wrote a letter to Mr. Stokes except as chairman of the Town Commissioners. As to the statement of sending a legal form, I never saw it in my life. Mr. Bentley was the gentleman who afterwards prepared the legal form, and it was already signed at the time I put my name to it. There is only one question that I wish to ask Mr. Stokes. It has been said that Leinster-road doesn't cost more than £10 a year. I should like to know what it cost when it was pitched?

Witness—I have not said that. That is not my evidence.

6852. CHAIRMAN.—He said that it cost over £30 a year. The way that was made up was this—they got £400, and the interest on that and £10 a year made up the £30 a year.

6853. Rev. Mr. Shire.—Would Mr. Stokes tell us what authority the Commissioners had for laying out and giving lighting to private roads?

Witness.—There is nothing in the world to prevent us from doing it.

6854. I want your legal authority. You decline to repair or remove incumbrances from private roads, and still you light them!—We light your road if it comes to that.

6855. What is your legal authority?—We have no authority.

6856. CHAIRMAN.—He says you light Leinster-road. What authority have you?

Witness.—We light every road whether it be repaired by us or not as a matter of public safety.

6857. Rev. Mr. Shire.—It is an illegal act.

Witness.—Not a bit of it. It is for the public safety.

6858. CHAIRMAN.—You have nothing to do with public safety on private roads. You are bound to light all public roads, but I don't know what authority you have to light private roads at all, particularly where you say you have nothing to do with scavenging them, or attending to incumbrances in them, on account of their being private roads, or leases. That is one of your difficulties, I think.

6859. Rev. Mr. Shire.—It has been also stated that the officers did not interfere in the elections. Does Mr. Stokes remember the remarkable scene between himself and myself and Mr. Parker at one general election, not many years ago. Mr. Parker had been acting as door porters to let the electors into the inner room.

6860. CHAIRMAN.—Do you recollect anything of that?

Witness.—If you will identify it.

6861. He says that Mr. Parker and you were there.

6862. Rev. Mr. Shire.—I do; they were acting as door porters, opening the door between the outer and the inner offices to let the electors in. I took an objection to your being in the office because you were not a ratepayer; do you remember that?

Witness.—I do.

6863. Was not that interfering?—No; you were interfering, and nobody else.

6864. Mr. Newson.—Let Mr. Stokes tell it himself.

Witness.—If you ask a question you should hear my answer, for you were the person who misconducted yourself, and not I. I have already stated in my direct evidence that the Secretary's office was appropriated to the use of the collectors, and I gave a part use of it to the representatives of the opposition in order that they might have the same information that we had. I remained in the office and interfered no further than by passing through from one office to the other, and getting their names and giving them out. The moment it was objected to I went away. Mr. Shire came in and canvassed, and interfered with the election, and I thought it better, for peace sake, to go out, but I had a perfect right to clear everybody out of the office.

6865. Rev. Mr. Shire.—A friend of my own promised to vote for the new man, and I said "don't forget the new man," and Mr. Stokes and I had no right to be in the office, and on the occasion he and Mr. Parker acted as door porters.

Witness.—I wish to add that Mr. Parker was not there at all.

6866. Rev. Mr. Shire.—He was present on the occasion.

Witness.—Mr. Parker was not there at all, good or bad.

6867. CHAIRMAN.—Maybe you are referring to a different occasion.

6868. Rev. Mr. Shire.—You remember that I objected to your being there because your place was inside, and you were not a ratepayer at all.

Witness.—That was not the case, because I was a ratepayer, and voted.

6869. Rev. Mr. Shire.—Not on that occasion.

Witness.—On that occasion; I was a ratepayer, and voted.

6870. Rev. Mr. Shire.—It was stated that the statement we made about the officers was false.

6871. CHAIRMAN.—Oh, no, no one said that what you said was false.

6872. Mr. Menzies.—It is merely a difference of memory between you and Mr. Stokes.

Witness.—I did not say that the officers were perfectly impartial; I contradicted the statement that they were engaged in canvassing.

6873. Rev. Mr. Shire.—It was asking the electors as they went in to vote for the old Board.

Witness.—If you will permit me there is one matter to which I wish to refer. I heard, with great astonishment, the statement made and reiterated over and over again, that there is but one crossing between Portobello-bridge and Rutherglen-road; I can state, from my own knowledge, that in place of one there are six.

6874. Dr. Narceau.—Where are they?

Witness.—There is one at Rutherglen Chapel; there is one at Leinster-road. I suppose that the statement was made that that crossing was made to a private road; it was made at the expense of myself and two or three proprietors, thirty or forty years ago.

6875. Dr. Narceau.—Opposite the Town Commissioners' office?

Witness.—Yes; there is one opposite to Leinster-square—Mr. Butler aside that at his own expense; there is one opposite the Post Office; one at Muriagh's, the butchers'; and one at Flynn's, the Police Station.

6876. Where is Muriagh's; is it near Castlewood-avenue?—No; it is not so far; so that there are six crossings where it was alleged that there was but one.

6877. What about the crossing that Mr. Shire spoke of as the place of worship?—He stated that he applied frequently to the Board, without success, to get crossings at his Church, and that at last you gave him one, and the rest were refused?—Well, our funds were somewhat limited for that kind of work, and we

passed a resolution, which we kept to as well as we could, that no crossing should be made unless half the money was subscribed. Anyone could get a crossing opposite his own hall-door, if he paid half the cost of it.

6878. Are there any at Harold's-cross Church?—I think not. Harold's-cross Church is not in the township. I beg your pardon, I am wrong, it is in the township.

6879. Is there a crossing at the Presbyterian Church?—There is.

6880. Are you sure of that?—Quite sure. There is only one Presbyterian Church in the township, and there is a very expensive crossing there to which they contribute £10. It cost £30, I think.

6881. CHAIRMAN.—There is one other little master

only, why was it that you never had by-laws made for the regulation of slaughter-houses?

WITNESS.—That I cannot tell you. I tried very hard to get slaughter-houses done away with.

6882. You licensed them?—We had to license them. I called on all the butchers in the township, and we offered to build them a public slaughter-house and to give them the management of it without charge, but they would not. We offered to let a committee of them manage it, and to charge them only a nominal rent, but they would not accept the offer.

6883. DR. NEWWOOD.—Are any rents derived by the Commissioners from carriages or car houses?—No; I think not.

DR. NEWWOOD
July 1, 1878.
Mr. F. Stokes

MR. J. H. EVANS, examined.

MR. J. H.
EVANS

6884. MR. MASON.—What is your position exactly with reference to Rathmines township?—I am Secretary to the township.

6885. I want to call your attention to a few points. It has been stated in evidence that several of the Commissioners own house property to a considerable extent, paying the taxes for them, and that thus they have a paramount interest in reducing taxation to the lowest point. State exactly how many Commissioners are in point of fact owners of house property, and the amount of taxes they pay, so as to show exactly how the thing stands!

6886. Of the present Board of Commissioners ten are owners of houses, landlords of houses. They pay rates to the amount of £418 8s. 4d. Three of them pay £200 of that. Then there are other Commissioners who pay rates on the houses they occupy as tenants.

6887. Can you give me an idea of what effect the shifting in the pound that they spoke of would have on the Commissioners' rate?—If their rates were increased by 1s. in the pound it would increase that amount by one-half, by about £200.

6888. What is the present rating?—2s. 4d., which includes 4d., main drainage rate.

6889. CHAIRMAN.—They pay 2s. as against 3s. 6d. in Pimlico township.

6890. MR. MASON.—In fact it would make a difference of £200 a year between ten?—Between ten.

6891. With reference to the sanitary arrangements of the township, can you tell me anything more about the sanitary officers?—I think I gave that in my former examinations, I am the executive sanitary officer. There is a sub-sanitary officer who was appointed early in February, and along with him there is a disinfector officer. I may mention that all these appointments are subject to the approval of the Local Government Board and I have it here.

6892. In point of fact, are not the sanitary officers of the township under the Public Health Act of 1878, subject to the approval of the Local Government Board?—Since 1874 it has been subject to their approval.

6893. In point of fact the staff has been approved of by them?—It has been approved of.

6894. MR. COTTON.—Do the Local Government Board know that your sub-sanitary officer holds the post of bell porter?—They do.

6895. DR. NEWWOOD.—And engine-keeper?

WITNESS.—He is not engine-keeper.

6896. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean that from 1874 to 1878 the Local Government Board knew that the only person you had was this bell porter?—Of course.

6897. And approved of it?—(The witness asked for a book.)

6898. CHAIRMAN.—If they did there is no one to blame for it. The policeman was only appointed in February last. From 1874 down to February last they must have known that the only sanitary officer you had was this man, at £15 a year, who was bound to be at the Town Hall from ten o'clock to four o'clock;

daily?—They knew that. They were fully aware of it, for they pay one-half of it.

6899. MR. STOKES himself says that the sanitary staff is wholly inefficient. How the Local Government Board could have passed it I cannot understand at all.

WITNESS.—Here is the letter of the Local Government Board in reference to this appointment. The Commissioners thought it quite unnecessary to appoint a consulting sanitary officer at first. The Local Government Board gave us in at the time, but afterwards required us to make the appointment.

6900. CHAIRMAN.—This letter only relates to the consulting medical officer.

WITNESS.—I will get you the other.

6901. DR. NEWWOOD.—What is this?

WITNESS.—The approval of the Local Government Board to the appointment of the officers.

6902. CHAIRMAN.—What is the staff which you proposed to the Local Government Board in 1874, and which they accepted?

WITNESS.—An executive sanitary officer, a sub-sanitary officer, and a medical officer of health.

6903. CHAIRMAN.—Let us see whether they were appointed at the time that the sub-sanitary officer was the man in charge of the Town Hall?

WITNESS.—This letter came on the 20th of November, 1874:—

“With reference to the appointment of a sub-sanitary officer, the Board request that they may be informed if Frederick Wright was previously in the service of the Commissioners, and if so, in what capacity, and at what salary, and whether it is a new appointment?”

6904. Have you the letter to which that is an answer?—I have not the letter-book here.

6905. Wright was the hall porter?—Yes. [Reads.]

“9th December, 1874.

“The Board also approve of the additional salary fixed by the sanitary authority for Frederick Wright, as sanitary sub-officer of the district, of £15 per annum.”

That is in addition to his £16. per week.

6906. DR. NEWWOOD.—Do you know the terms of your letter informing them who Wright was?—I will get you the return they require to be filled before the payment of the money.

6907. Did you tell them that he was bell-ringer to the parish and postman?—He was not anything of the kind, so I could not have told them that.

6908. Is he the bell-ringer now?—He is not. We have not a bell at all.

6909. Not even a fire-bell?—There is a bell in the yard.

6910. He never was postman?—Never.

6911. I am instructed that he was?—Well, if you call a man a postman who was a deliverer of circulars for the Commissioners, and who went to the post office with them, he was. Here is the statement required by the Local Government Board in connection with salaries paid to the sanitary officer.—“Frederick Wright, caretaker of the offices of the Commissioners of Rathmines and Rathgar, 16s. a week as sub-san-

DORSET.
Aug 1, 1878.
Mr. J. H.
Evans.

try officer, £15 a year.⁷ That had the full approval of the Local Government Board. We have heard a good deal of his being half parson; but what has he to do? To stay in the office from ten o'clock until four, and if anyone comes in to direct him where to go. When I am in the office if there is anything to be done he is quite at liberty to go and serve notices; and if a sanitary complaint comes in I send him out about it at once.

6912 Mr. Monksdon.—If a sanitary complaint be made, to whom would it be addressed?—To me.

6913. He is the man attending in the place?—He lives in it.

6914. And on any complaint coming to you, in the ordinary course you would send him about it?—I would send him at once.

6915. So that in fact it is rather a convenience to have him there for sanitary purposes?—I should say so.

6916. CHAIRMAN.—But that is not the object of a sub-sanitary officer, and no one knows that better than yourself. The sub-sanitary officer should be out all over the district from day to day, looking after those things.

Witness.—His duty was to do that in after hours.

6917. Show me anything about "after hours" in any of those sections?—His duties ceased at the Town Hall at five o'clock in the evening.

6918. That would be no time for him to set out inspecting nuisances through twenty-three miles of roads and streets in order to see what they existed. Show me anything in the Act of Parliament which says that the Sanitary Authority is not to act until a complaint is made to the executive office. That appears to be your Rathmines notion—nothing to be done until some one sends in a complaint, and then the executive or sub-sanitary officer was to go out and look after it. But they were to do nothing until a complaint was made.

6919. Mr. Monksdon.—Well, I am afraid that has been too common.

6920. CHAIRMAN.—You, as counsel to the Local Government Board, knew perfectly well that there is no such thing in the Sanitary Act.

6921. Mr. Monksdon.—There certainly has been a practice of that sort. I don't say that it is a right one. (*To witness.*) Are you in a position to tell us the number of cessings along the road from Portobello Bridge to Rathgar?—The six that have been already mentioned.

6922. You confirm what Mr. Stokes has said?—I am fully aware of it.

6923. It has been stated that the officers of the Town Commissioners have exercised influence at the elections. I ask you did you ever do anything of the sort?—I did not. I took an interest in the elections, but I never influenced the electors; I had quite enough to do for a month previous to the elections without having anything to do with them.

6924. Of course you are acquainted with Rathmines township as compared with Pengee?—I am.

6925. Comparing Rathmines with Pengee, which of the two has the greater number of dwelling houses of a poor class valued at and under £5 a year?—I cannot speak of Pengee. I can give you the number of houses under £5 in my own township. I know that there are two districts in Pengee township, namely Irishtown and Ringend, which are the only poor districts they have; but I cannot give you the number of houses.

6926. I don't ask you to give me the exact numbers, can you tell from what you know whether there is a greater number of poor dwellings and inhabitants in Pengee than in Rathmines?—I scarcely think there is much difference.

Cross-examined by Dr. Norwood.

6927. You say this man is there from ten o'clock until four?—I say he is there night and day, for he lives there.

6928. Is not it a fact that he delivers all the documents

for the Commissioners?—He either posts them or delivers them; the majority of them are posted.

6929. In point of fact he does deliver them?—He does.

6930. Who attends to the sanitary duties when he is delivering letters or notices?—Well, I think he could carry on both together. Going through the district he has frequent opportunities of seeing whether there are nuisances, or whether anything is wrong as sanitary matters.

6931. Is it only after hours that he inspects nuisances?—I have already said that if a nuisance is complained of he is sent off at once.

6932. You are always there from day to day?—I am.

6933. Always in stepdane?—Except when I am on business in town connected with the Board.

6934. You have other business elsewhere?—I have business of the Board in town, and have had business connected with the Main Drainage Board for the last year and a half.

6935. Are you in the office in Dame-street during the day?—No; it only requires an attendance now and then while the Board meet; my assistant takes my place.

6936. What is the age of the gentleman?—I should say he is twenty years of age.

6937. A young lad?—A young lad.

6938. Is he the only person in attendance in your absence to answer the ratepayers when they come?—The only one.

6939. Is Mr. Stokes correct in saying that nobody ever goes there?—Oh, I cannot say that.

6940. You would not like to say that he is not correct—that no one ever comes?—Oh, no, Mr. Stokes could not say that.

6941. Mr. Stokes—I say that no one ever comes to inspect it.

6942. Dr. Norwood (to witness)—Was that because they knew there were no maps to inspect?—Wherever they wanted a sewer opened they came and made application.

6943. Have you got the map that was there?—Our surveyor has it.

6944. Why was not it produced to the Commissioners who asked for it frequently?—It is hanging up.

6945. Is it posted to the wall?—No, it is not.

6946. There was a distinct notice making that the map should be produced.

6947. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Stokes has already said that there was a thing that he over and over again complained of as not having been done, and that he wanted to have done. The question is, has the thing been done or not?

Witness.—The surveyor has a map on which all the old sewers are marked.

6948. Then where is it?—Mr. Stokes said he was always complaining that he could not get the thing done. Mr. Evans says it is done. If so, where is it?

Witness.—I understand it was the map that we had before.

6949. It is not—is there another map?—There is another map.

6950. All this tends to show that the Rathmines Commissioners have never carried out the Act of Parliament.

6951. Mr. Monksdon.—Will you produce that map to-morrow?

Witness.—The surveyor has no objection to produce it, I can assure.

6952. CHAIRMAN.—It belongs to the Town Commissioners, and ought to be produced.

Witness.—It will be produced.

6953. Mr. Johnston.—The map is not in very good order, and I did not like to bring it in on that account, but if you wish it shall be here to-morrow.

6954. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Stokes has said that he was always trying to get a map made in pursuance of the Act of Parliament, but that he could not.

6955. Dr. Norwood.—Mr. Stokes has stated in his

evidence that the sewerage and drainage of the township is perfect, and we want to see how he came to that conclusion without a map.

6936. CHAIRMAN.—You can do that without a map; that is not the view I am taking. Mr. Stokes' attention was called to the fact that it was necessary to have the Act of Parliament complied with, which is very different from Mr. Evans' notion of it, for his notion was that there was nothing binding on them until the Act of 1873.

Witness.—Excuse me! I was a Commissioner at the very first, and I knew a good deal about it.

6937. Very well, then, if you did, and if all the gentlemen knew it; and if Mr. Johnston, who is a gentleman of great ability as a surveyor, would not carry out the directions of the Commissioners and the Act of Parliament, why was he kept there and why was not it done?

6938. Mr. Johnston.—The other map is against the wall, and it is a little faded, and that is why it was not brought down.

6939. CHAIRMAN.—I won't say from day to day, but from year to year, at all events, as changes were made in the sewers, these changes should have been entered on a map from time to time, so that "he who runs may read," as they say; because no man could properly know where to place a house, or how to arrange the sewerage of it, without such knowledge.

6940. Dr. Norwood (to witness).—Were there complaints constant and numerous on account of your absence from the Town Hall?—Not that I am aware of.

6941. You never heard of them?—No.

6942. Would you be surprised to hear that they were made?—I would not be surprised at anything.

6943. CHAIRMAN.—We have Mr. Bolton stating that Mr. Evans was there always.

6944. Rev. Mr. Shire.—I frequently came to consult Mr. Evans in the office, and he was not there to be consulted.

6945. Dr. Norwood.—Mr. Evans states that he is away on business frequently.

Witness.—I am not on business there now; I am on business here.

6946. Dr. Norwood (to witness).—Don't you hold a farm in the county of Wexford?—I have a tract of land there.

6947. Do you attend to it?—Not as much as I ought.

6948. You are on public Board?—I am on the South Union Board.

6949. Do you attend there?—Not as constantly as I would like to do.

6950. Am't you Chairman of the Dispensary Committee of Ruthmines?—I am.

6951. Do you attend that?—For half an hour once a month.

6952. How do you manifest your interest in the elections?—I don't understand you.

6953. You say that you took an interest in the elections, but that you have not interfered in them?—I have not interfered. Of course I have an interest in the outgoing members of the Board, and I would like to see them re-elected.

6954. It is with your sanction that the officers direct the circulars of the outgoing members of the Board?—I have no control over the officers.

6955. You have no control over your officers—that will do me; did they do it?—One collector did at the request of the outgoing candidate. It was in the month of November his collection had been made good, and he had nothing to do. He was asked to do it, and it did not interfere with his duty in any way.

6956. Who inspects the scavengers and roadmen?—The Surveyor.

6957. The Surveyor?—And his assistant.

6958. Who is his assistant?—Mr. Smith.

6959. Is that the hall porter?—No; Frederick Wright is the hall porter.

Dowse.
July 1, 1873.
Mr. J. H.
Evans.

6950. Is Smith the machinist?—No; he is the road-overseer.

6951. That is the man who looks after the Fire Brigade?—He is a general man.

6952. What different positions does Smith fill?—He is road overseer, and he oversees the water arrangements. He gives directions about them, but does not oversee them. He is under Mr. Johnston.

6953. What else does he do? Suppose he is inspecting roads at Harold's-cross, and that a fire takes place in Castlewood-avenue, what do you do then?—I suppose some one would go to him, or he is sent for.

6954. What else does he do? Is he collector also? No.

6955. What other situation does he hold?—He has no other situation.

6956. Is he the only person who inspects the roadmen, workmen, and scavengers?—Well, they have two other men in minor posts. Mr. Johnston can explain those arrangements better than I can.

6957. You ought to know all about the township. Aren't you their chief executive officer?—I have to keep their minutes and make all their payments. I could not tell where the men work. I am Secretary to the Board, and have nothing to say to it.

6958. CHAIRMAN.—We were told last day that a book showing the week done by every man was laid regularly before the Board.

6959. Dr. Norwood.—One of the witnesses was asked was there any record kept daily showing how many men were employed, and for how long, and at what work, and he stated that there was.

Witness.—There was not.

6960. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Bolton was asked whether there was not some one to take care of the Town Hall, and his answer was that Mr. Evans was there all day; that the officers did not stand on their dignity; that Mr. Evans showed anyone who came the map, and gave them any information that they required.

Witness.—Quite so.

6961. You now say that you are not there the whole time?—My assistant is there if I am not.

6962. The young lad of twenty years of age. How long has he been in your employment?—Very nearly three years.

6963. What can he know of the affairs of the township?—Well, he is quite intimate with them.

6964. I am told that Smith is an extensive market gardener. Is that so?—Well, I believe he has gardens.

6965. Who minds his gardens while he is inspecting the roads and attending to the affairs of the township?—That is a matter I have nothing to say to.

6966. You have nothing to say to it; isn't he bound to give up his whole time to your service?—That is the Board's business and not mine.

6967. I must say I don't understand this. Last day Mr. Bolton referred us to you, and said you could give us information on every matter. You refer us to Mr. Johnston, and he again refers us to you, and I don't know between all of you where we are to get the information. My recollection is, that it was in evidence, and if so, it may be on the books that a book of that kind is kept?—It cannot be in reference to Pemroke township. There is no such book kept. We have a list of the payments made each week—a wages book.

6968. Dr. Norwood.—How many hours a day are you in attendance?—I am often there till six in the evening, from nine in the morning, and often work at home myself up to ten and eleven o'clock at night.

6969. With regard to the elections, have you ever known members of the Board to interfere in the bringing up of voters?—Of course members of the Board have done so, but not as a Board. As individuals they have.

6970. Have you known the Chairman of the Board to do so?—I have. I think he has acknowledged it.

6971. And to attend there all day?—To attend at the elections?

DONISTH.
Aug 5, 1878.
Mr. J. H.
Evans.

7002. Yes!—The election only lasts one day.
7003. During the entire day. Were those circulars that were mentioned by Mr. Stokes, in his examination, directed from the Town Hall?—Well, I don't say they were.

7004. CHAIRMAN.—Were they printed circulars?—I don't know. I had nothing to say to it.

7005. Mr. Stokes.—They never were addressed from the Town Hall in any case!—Never.

7006. Dr. Nervood.—I did not say that they were addressed from the Town Hall. They were addressed and put into envelopes at the Town Hall by the collectors—the officers of the Commissioners.

Witness.—By one collector only. By no other officer of the Board.

7007. Dr. Nervood.—I don't care whether it was by one officer or by five, but they were put into envelopes at the Town Hall, and sent out from the Town Hall.

Witness.—Along with the assistants sent there by the candidates to do it.

7008. Have the goodness to read that little advertisement for the Commissioners. (Witness reads.) "Rathmines Commissioners. The annual meeting of the Rathmines Commissioners was held yesterday. Present: E. Fattrell, &c. Some business having been transacted, the meeting adjourned."

7009. Was that meeting conducted with closed doors?—It was.

7010. As all your meetings are. Was that all the information the ratepayers got of the meeting?—That's all. There was no other business done at that meeting.

7011. Isn't that the general form in which the business transacted at your meetings is announced to the ratepayers?—It is not.

7012. Have you a copy of the general form?—I have not. That is the annual meeting, which is specially summoned only for the election of chairman for the year.

7013. What was the "routine business"?—The "routine business" was the warrant of the Grand Jury for 1879, which came the day before and was submitted that day. The ordinary notice contains the amounts received for rates and the cheques signed.

7014. Does it give particulars of the cheques signed?—It does not.

7015. Or any particulars?—It gives the amount.

7016. Is the monthly report much longer than that one?—It is about as long again.

7017. Does it give any account of the transactions of the Commissioners except the items that you have mentioned?—Nothing, unless there is something very special.

7018. How do the ratepayers get any intimation of the business done at the Board?—Well, excepting a very few, they don't want it, nor never asked for it.

7019. You used to meet at first once a week?—Never. Once a fortnight, and then once every three weeks, and then we found the meetings were dwindling, and that not the same interest was taken in them as before.

7020. When did you commence to publish those notices?—About four years ago.

7021. And up to that time the ratepayers got no intimation of what was done at the Board?—Nor did they ask it.

7022. Did they know who were the Commissioners in attendance?—They did not ask that either. They had full confidence in them.

7023. Did you ever hear any complaints about it?—About what?

7024. About not having information of the transactions of the Board?—Well, of course in a township like Rathmines, with 3,000 ratepayers, you could not please everyone.

7025. Weren't there frequent complaints of the non-admission of the press?—Not frequent; only now and then.

7026. Didn't every address of the opposition candidates complain of the want of information?

7027. Mr. Monahan.—I don't like to interfere, but—

7028. Dr. Nervood.—Well, don't interfere.

7029. Mr. Monahan.—This matter about the press will lead to an awful investigation.

7030. CHAIRMAN.—We don't see that we should go into this.

Witness.—The Penrhoske Township Commissioners don't admit the press to their meetings.

7031. Dr. Nervood [to the witness].—Who are the twenty men who attend in case of fire?—I never said there were twenty.

7032. Who are the men?—Mr. Johnston will answer that.

7033. CHAIRMAN.—It was said by Mr. Bolton that there was a sort of a staff, and that that "sort of a staff" included all the men. Now, Mr. Evans, you got that book [produced] from the Local Government Board?—Yes.

7034. Do you see your attention distinctly called in 1874 to all the previous Sanitary Acts. Did the Rathmines Commissioners ever adopt any of the clauses of the Sanitary Acts prior to 1874, or any of the Township Acts which are incorporated with your special Acts?—They did.

7035. What did they do? Tell me a single thing they ever did!—Did you make regulations for lodging-houses?—We have no lodging-houses in the township.

7036. Why, Mr. Bolton says there are.

Witness.—But they did not come under the definition.

7037. Under the definition of common lodging houses?—They did not. I had to make a return to the Local Government Board, and I did make it.

7038. Did you make by-laws for the slaughter-houses?—We did not.

7039. Have you any disfecting apparatus?—No.

7040. Your notion is that unless complaints were made you were not to do anything?—I don't know that. Our officers have directions, and are going everywhere about complaints.

7041. How is the Act of 1874, and the directions of the Local Government Board?—It shall be the duty of the Nuisance Authority to make from time to time, either by itself or by its officers, &c.

7042. Tell me who did that?—You said that when a complaint was made, Wright was sent to look after it!—That was in the daytime.

7043. But he could not make an inspection by night.

7044. Can you yourself say now, that the Rathmines Town Commissioners, as a Nuisance Authority, ever complied with the twentieth section of the Act of 1874?—I am sure they did.

7045. Who did it?—The sanitary officer.

7046. Who was that?—Our medical officer.

7047. You did not?—I did not. Our sanitary officer, Dr. Brouns, did it. He was first our officer of health.

7048. You don't say that he was to inspect privies and cesspools and water-closets for the entire twenty-three miles?—Well, he had for all the lanes, and everything came under his notice.

7049. Can you undertake to say that Dr. Brouns ever did such a thing?—The last day I produced a book of Dr. Brouns's reports.

7050. You don't mean that it was ever intended that Dr. Brouns was to be the person who was to make house to house inspections?—Not from house to house.

7051. But do you mean to say that he was to be himself the officer to inspect the district, as to ascertain what nuisances existed which required abatement under the provisions of the Nuisance and the Public Health Acts—that was what was to be done?—So we did.

7052. Then had you anyone to do it but the hall porter?—As I have already said, the other man gave him information of anything that required attention, and it was immediately inspected.

7053. How did you know that they did it at all?—By the reports that they made.

7054. Was it your notion that the executive sanitary

officer—that is, yourself—was to go over the district?—No, it is not part of my duty.

7055. Dr. Norwood.—With respect to the disinfecting of premises in Ruthin, did you know that Wright had been in charge of the disinfecting of premises?—He has not for the last four months.

7056. Previous to that?—Previous to that we might only have one case in a month, or not one case in three months.

7057. Did he do it?—He either did it or got it done.

7058. Has he done it himself?—I presume he has.

7059. Was that in the course of his delivery of letters?—I am astonished at you asking that question, Dr. Norwood.

7060. I was told that he went to inspect where small-pox patients were, and then to deliver letters?—Well, it is not the fact.

7061. CHAIRMAN.—Have you any one of the books of reports made by Mr. Wright?—I produced a book of reports the last day.

7062. Dr. Norwood.—Have you a report as to his disinfecting of premises?—The sub-sanitary officer has said you will get all the reports here in a few minutes.

7063. Where are Mr. Wright's reports?—I produced them the last day. Not Mr. Wright's, but the present sanitary officer's.

7064. Can he write?—He can.

7065. Will you have Mr. Wright's reports here tomorrow?—If I can lay my hand on them I will.

7066. CHAIRMAN.—They should be in a book.

Witness.—I produced the present sanitary officer's reports. I did not produce Wright's.

7067. There is a great difference between last year's reports, and this year's.

7068. Dr. Norwood.—Is Mr. Wright here?—

Witness.—He is. He can tell you where his report book is.

7069. Mr. Moseley.—He does not keep it himself.

7070. Dr. Norwood.—No, he does not, but I suppose it is in the custody of the executive sanitary officer. (To witness) What is the amount of your debt in Ruthin? Mr. Evans £30,000.

7071. What will be your debt for main drainage?—I cannot say what it is yet.

7072. Does it mean the full note you have struck?—It does for this year.

7073. Was not the cost of the main drainage estimated at £100,000?—Yes.

7074. Did you ever know a case in which such works were carried out for the estimate?—I did.

7075. Do you expect that your works will be carried out for the estimated sum?—We do, for considerably under it.

7076. How much?—I dare say £10,000 or £15,000.

7077. What are your animal rates in Ruthin?—£11,400.

7078. What is your sinking fund?—One third of £20,000.

7079. Is that taken out of the 2s. rate?—It is.

7080. Was it paid last year?—It was.

7081. And the year before?—Yes.

7082. When did you first establish the sinking fund?—When we first borrowed money. For some few years we were unable to pay the sinking fund, and we dropped it for one or two years, and then commenced paying it again.

7083. Was that legal, in your opinion?—That was not a question for me.

7084. Aren't you the director of the Commissioners?—I am not. I am their officer.

7085. Do you permit them to do what is illegal?—If they choose to do it, I could not prevent them.

7086. Did you not for years strike a rate for a sinking fund?—We paid it, although we did not strike a rate for it.

7087. Is it in the accounts?—It is.

7088. Is there any rate for it now?—Not this year, because we did not require it.

7089. Is it put off?—No.

7090. Why did you not require it this year?—Because the 2s. 4d. was enough to cover all.

7091. Then it was paid this year?—It was.

7092. What did you mean by saying it was not necessary?—It was not necessary to strike a special rate for it.

7093. Still it has been paid since you resumed the payment of it?—Yes.

7094. Without interruption?—Without interruption.

7095. Show me the last account where £400 for Llanfawr-road appears?—[Witness handed book.] And there are the contributions.

7096. Are these accounts sent annually to the rate-payers?—Not now. They were.

7097. To all the rate-payers?—Well, there were plenty of them at the office, and a number of them were sent.

7098. Were they sent to all?—I could not say to all.

7099. Were they published in the newspaper?—They were, regularly.

7100. Report and accounts?—Not the accounts, because the newspaper would not publish the accounts.

7101. Not publish the accounts?—why?—Except as an advertisement. The report was.

7102. To how many rate-payers were they sent?—Well, I really could not tell you that. We generally got 500 of them printed.

7103. Was that all the rate-payers got of the expenditure?

7104. CHAIRMAN.—What is meant that if the accounts are all correct? This has been all gone into before. [To witness] What is the meaning of this?—December 1st, 1877, Urban Sanitary Authority, The Executive Sanitary Officer reported that, by the direction of the Chairman, he convened a meeting of the owners and occupiers, on Tuesday, the 27th, to confer as to the best means to be adopted for the repair and maintenance of those roads." It does not say what roads. "A large number attended, and the probable amount estimated for their repair would be made up. The Executive Sanitary Officer to reply quickly?"—That was a private road. We were going to put the powers of the Act of 1874 into force, and before doing so, we wrote to the owners to get them together in order to try and get it done without that.

7105. I find letter after letter, complaining of nuisances, referred to the sanitary officer to inspect and report on them. I see a letter from John Johnson and Arthur Daniel in reference to defective sewers. "The sub-sanitary officer reported that he inspected the sewers, and found 18 of them. H. Green, innkeeper at 104, Upper Lewes-street, referred to the sanitary officer. George Mason complained of a nuisance from a place adjoining Governor-road. The Executive sanitary officer reported that he had made arrangements for the repair of the Township roads." That is, the Urban Sanitary Authority proposes these things, and arrangements are made by them with the Township Board!—They paid an estimated sum for the repairs when done.

7106. Here is a letter as to the state of Zion Road, Ruthgar, and the sewer connected with it. "The Urban Sanitary Authority does not consider that the repair of the road is within their duty, or under their control, but properly belongs to the Township Board." Is not that partition it from one to the other?—That is a private road.

7107. In reference to the sewerage, the Board are fully aware of the defective state?—That is the origin of our Main Drainage Bill.

7108. Why should they have allowed the sewers to be in that state?—This was the place where the cesspools were complained of on Zion terrace.

7109. I don't find a single report of the sub-sanitary officer originating any thing; only when a complaint came in it was referred to him to look after. But then I find that after the Act of 1878 passed the reports begin.—The sub-sanitary officer reported

July 1, 1878.
Mr. J. H.
Evans.

BURTON
July 1, 1875.
Mr. J. H.
Brown.

&c." It appears, in fact, that there was nothing done up to 1875.

7110. Rev. Mr. Shire.—I wish to ask the witness one or two questions. Was the sinking fund paid in 1876?—Not in 1876.

7111. Was it paid in 1875?—No. In 1874.

7112. CHAIRMAN.—I understand that the sinking fund has been regularly paid up to the present.

Witness.—I said that a few years had been dropped.

7113. What excuse have you for that?

Witness.—It was paid in 1870 and 1871.

7114. Rev. Mr. Shire.—It is entered as paid for 1870 and 1871, but nothing is entered as paid for 1874. I produced an Act of Parliament to show that you were acting illegally.

Witness.—There were two or three years in which it was dropped.

7115. CHAIRMAN.—Which was it, two or three, for it makes a very large difference?—I cannot say.

7116. Did the Board do that knowingly?—They had to do it.

7117. Why?—Because of the receipts.

7118. Why didn't they strike a rate fund?—They had no power to strike a rate.

7119. From the sinking fund?—It was not until the year 1874 that they had any power of striking a rate. The Act of 1874 gave them power. It extends the borrowing power, and the rating power. Before that they had no power to strike a rate for a sinking fund.

7120. Dr. Norwood.—Did they not pay it in 1872 and 1873?—Because they had funds.

7121. CHAIRMAN.—When the Act of 1874 was passed did you strike a rate for the two back years?—We did.

7122. Then you were taxing the people of 1874 to help out the people that ought to have paid in 1873?—We had not the power to do it before.

7123. Rev. Mr. Shire.—I complained that it was very unfair that people who were getting houses property that should be paying for people who ought to have paid before.

7124. CHAIRMAN.—I find that you have twenty men and eight horses for Rotherham?—The twenty men don't include the drivers of three horses. The twenty are scavengers. The surveyor will give you all the particulars.

7125. But why do you refer everything to the surveyor. The town clerk of a township should surely know all its staff. Mr. Bolton never said a word about drivers?—The men are often taken on and dismissed. There are eight drivers. You must remember that we deliver no material on the roads. It is all delivered by the contractors.

7126. They have eight horses in at a cost of £1 a week each for scavenging. If notwithstanding that, there are complaints, would you say that things can be done right with your eight horses?—I cannot give a competent opinion as to whether eight horses are enough or not, but I think they are more than enough.

7127. You heard the statement made to-day, that since we sat here on the last day there has been extraordinary diligence used in cleaning up the township?—Not a bit. Not an extra man has been employed.

7128. That may be; but you heard the statement of the witnesses, that since we sat here on the 19th of May, and the 1st of June, they left their homes in the morning leaving those animals subsisting in the lanes and places. Did you go or send a sub-sanitary officer to see if that was the fact?—I did not myself. It is not my duty; I sent the sub-sanitary officer, Mr. McEvoy, to inspect all those places, and I got reports from him.

7129. And he reported that there were not any uncleanances?—In several cases he reported that it was a mere nothing.

7130. You heard Mr. Bradley, the Rev. Mr. Shire, Mr. Bentley, Mr. Mages, and all those gentlemen, state that up to the insuring they were examined, they

could positively declare that for three months previously the filthiest ditch was in the lanes they named. Did you go to see that yourself?—I did not.

7131. You sent Mr. McEvoy?—Yes.

7132. Did he give you a written statement that what these gentlemen had said was false?—He did not give me a statement that their statement was false, but he gave me the exact circumstances of each case. I have it in his report book.

7133. But those gentlemen stated that to their knowledge they saw those things lying there for months. What answer did he give to that?—If you ask my knowledge of it, I will tell you that their statements were most exaggerated.

7134. How do you know if you did not visit the place yourself?—I mean the places that were under my knowledge.

7135. I speak of the places to which they referred, and which you and I did not visit?—No, I did not.

7136. To your knowledge, was there ever any arrangement made with your surveyor as to the time he was to devote to the business of the Board, and the time he was to give to his private affairs?—He was elected long before I was.

7137. Went you before Mr. Bolton?—I was a member of the Board at the time.

7138. Are you aware whether there was any arrangement made with him?—I don't think there was any arrangement made with him. You were speaking of the lanes. The day after the meeting have I sent the sub-sanitary officer to inspect the lane which Mr. French complained of as being very bad, and to have it cleaned. The sub-sanitary officer first reported that there was no nuisance in it, but only building refuse from the gardens, and the lane was then cleaned out on the 14th of June.

7139. Why was it cleaned out if there was no nuisance in it?—Well, to satisfy Mr. French.

7140. That was not what Mr. French complained of. He did not complain of building refuse, which is harmless old mortar, and fresh mortar, so far from being a nuisance, would be a disinfectant. What he complained of was the filthy stuff that was lying there. He stated that he complained of it over and over again and got no satisfaction?—The sub-sanitary officer reported that there was no filthy stuff in it.

7141. You chose, as executive sanitary officer, to take the word of the sub-sanitary officer against the statement of this gentleman?—Well, the lane was cleaned out.

7142. I want to know why it was cleaned out if there was no nuisance in it?—To satisfy Mr. French.

7143. He was complaining for months that it was not cleaned out?—A few days after I got a letter from the landlord that the Commissioners' man entered his premises at Rotherham to remove rubbish without my notice to me, although they had my name and address, and without there being a nuisance of any sort. I don't say they did any harm, but I will not be accountable for any harm they did do.

7144. Who is that gentleman?—The owner, the Rev. Mr. French.

7145. Dr. Norwood.—What Mr. French said was that he complained to the Commissioners and that they refused to hear him.

7146. CHAIRMAN (to witness).—Did you ascertain whether it was the fact that the township carts had deposited road stuff and scavenging in Kemelworth-square. Mr. Bradley stated that he saw it with his own eyes?—I will produce Mr. Bradley's three letters.

7147. Mr. Bradley.—I would be very glad that they were read.

Witness.—Those are the only four letters that ever came from Mr. Bradley.

7148. CHAIRMAN.—Read Mr. Bradley's letter of 6th October, 1877, asking for an explanation why, for the past ten days, no watering cart had appeared in the square. While in another letter of the 6th October, 1877, he stated that the carts of the Commissioners were driven into the square, and dust deposited thereon.

What answer was given to those letters? Mr. Bradley stated that in his evidence and his letter of the 5th October, 1877—written two years ago—corroborates it. Is it not a fact that the Town Commissioners' carts did not water the square, but were sent to deposit the manuring stuff on the lawn, or whatever you call it, at the corner of the square, and, next, who paid for the removal of this stuff to a place into which your case is that you had no right to enter, it being private property not in your charge?—Oh, no, it is not. Keworth-square is not a private square. Inside the railings is private, but we are in the habit of giving road and sewage stuff to any ratepayer that applies for it, in order to fill up hollows and levels. We are glad to get rid of it.

7149. That is in the nature of measure?—It is not. On receipt of that letter I sent Dr. Browne, the Medical Officer of Health, to inspect the thing, in order to see whether it was in the nature of a nuisance, and he said it was no such thing.

7150. I would like to know what answer you gave Mr. Bradley as to that?—(Witness reads)—

“I submitted your letter of the 5th instant to the Board, and am directed to inform you that the Surveyor reports that the roads round the square have been regularly watered. As to the road stuff, the Board give it to anyone who applies for it.”

7151. In other words, you said—“we believe the statement of our man against you.” That is just your answer. Did you make any inquiry except through this man, who says, “I deny it”?—We asked the surveyor.

7152. Do you see that, Mr. Bradley says he makes the complaint on behalf of himself and several residents, who complain of the same thing?—We never had a complaint from the same square only from Mr. Bradley himself!

7153. He writes on behalf of others?—That may be.

7154. Is your answer to this particular letter that you submitted it to the surveyor?—To the Board?—

“I submitted your letter to the Board at their meeting this day, and am directed to inform you that the Surveyor reports that the roads round the square have been regularly watered.”

7155. Show me the report of Mr. Johnston?—He was at present at the Board meeting.

7156. Did they take his word against the statements of Mr. Bradley and all the others without the slightest inquiry?—Well, I think they did; they had no other course.

7157. Oh, pardon me—I deny that altogether. Mr. Bradley then writes to them?—

“Why the report of your surveyor should be accepted by the Board as satisfactory, as against the complaint contained in my letter of the 5th without inquiry, I am at a loss to understand. It is not my habit to make a charge without being in a position to prove it; and I do feel aggrieved at the complaint arrived at by the Commissioners, I feel it justice to myself and the residents of the square whom views I put forward that an inquiry should be entered into. The report of the surveyor I charge to be a deliberate and wilful misrepresentation of the facts, and I go further by saying, that any official capable of making so gross a misrepresentation of facts to his Board ought not to be allowed to keep his position. The charge I made you, that the roads round the square had not been watered for a considerable period, and that the dust which was permitted to accumulate was a very great nuisance to the residents. Why should there have been such an accumulation of dust that several loads should have been collected and carried on the road side, and the next day deposited for top dressing upon land forming the square, the property of one member of the Board?”

I don't think there is much difficulty in coming to the conclusion that what was “meant thereby” was, that one member of the Board was favoured by getting it!—Not more favoured than any other ratepayer.

7158. Oh, but this is a direct charge?—

“The fact so spread is yet to be seen. There is, in my humble judgment, a great difference between road dust and road stuff, but both are nuisances at any time. Dust is a far greater nuisance than the other. As a ratepayer, I ob-

ject to other dust or road stuff being permitted to accumulate till it suits the convenience of the contractor or other persons to have same collected for top-dressing or otherwise.”

DORSET.
July 1, 1879
Mr. J. H.
Lynn.

Was there a contractor?—No.

7159. Then he is in error there?—

“The roads are not intended to as they should be, neither are the pathways. I have been spears of ten years resident in the square, and within that period I am not ignorant when I say that our pathways on each side of the square have been gravelled twice. It may have been done the o time but I am positive not more. Keworth-square, of late has been much deteriorated. Many hawthorn shrubs have been removed, and a portion of the west side has been turned into a cabbage and potato garden, causing a very offensive odour from the rotten leaves. . . . In fact everything has been done to render the place malignant and offensive, thereby trying to depreciate the value of the property. If the owner were not a Commissioner I doubt that the local staff or dust could find its way on the square. I hope the Board will in future not sanction its being deposited there. There is one thing at least which is officially looked to, namely, the collection of rates. A painful amount of parsimony is evinced in this regard. I don't at all complain of that, but the ratepayers are at least entitled to some value for their money and this is all that is required. Accept my apology for being so troublesome.”

7160. Was there any answer to that letter?—I submitted my letter of the 13th and the 18th to the board, and was directed to inform him to reply thus:—“The board regret very much the nuisance you complain of, and the practice of delivering road stuff on the square will be discontinued.”

7161. You see that they regretted the nuisance he complained of—that is, the roads not having been watered for ten days?—In November we ceased to water the square.

7162. That ignores the Surveyor's report.

Mr. Moonsherry.—Is not the “nuisance” alluded to there the deposit of dust on the square?

7163. CHAIRMAN.—He says his letter of the 18th?—

“I regret to trouble you again. . . . This morning no less than three carts of the Commissioners came with liquid mud which was deposited in a heap facing my dwelling-house where it will be permitted to remain until it suits the convenience of the Commissioner who is the owner to have it spread on the land to enrich it for his next year's crop. I respectfully protest against the continuance of this nuisance. . . . If complaints are of no value, and the nuisance be continued an effort will be made at least to prevent its continuance.”

By that he meant I presume that he would take legal proceedings to prevent the nuisance. After that you say—“We will give orders to have it stopped.” That is, you admitted that it was a nuisance?—No, we did not admit that it was a nuisance at all.

7164. He threatened to take proceedings against you, Mr. Bradley?—And notwithstanding that it was discontinued afterwards.

7165. CHAIRMAN (to witness).—Who did it after the Commissioners and they would not allow it to be done by anyone else?—I cannot answer that.

7166. Do you say that the board authorised it to be done?—I do not.

7167. How did the carts of the Town Commissioners come to deliver it again on Mr. Murphy's ground?—I cannot tell.

7168. Did Mr. Murphy ask anyone for it?—I suppose he asked the Surveyor.

7169. Under whose direction was it done?—I suppose under his.

7170. You are the sanitary officer?—This is not a sanitary matter.

7171. Mr. Bradley treats it as a grossly offensive nuisance?—I have already answered that, I sent the officer of health to inspect it, and his report was that there was no nuisance.

7172. When Mr. Bradley writes that it is a nuisance, and that he will take proceedings against the Commissioners to stop it, you write back to say that the Board have authorised you to discontinue it?—They thought that it was better to discontinue it than to have Mr. Bradley complaining.

Dewan,
July 1, 1889
Mr. J. H.
Livesey

7173. No—that to have him taking proceedings!—No, the Board were not afraid of that.

7174. How often, to your knowledge, has Mr. Murphy done it since with the Commissioners' carts?—I cannot tell you.

7175. Mr. Bradley.—They have done it every season. When I last complained the letter I got from Mr. Evans was, that they would not interfere.

Witness.—Handed another letter.

7176. The CHAIRMAN read the letter which was from Mr. Bradley again complaining of the nuisance; and asked for an answer to it.

Witness.—Read—

"I have submitted your letter of the 26th to the Board and am directed to say, that they have no control over the management of Kentworth-square. . . . The owner requested a few loads to be delivered, and as the same privilege is granted to other ratepayers the Board see no objection to it."

7177. Although the year before they had ordered it not to be done!—To please Mr. Bradley I had sent the medical officer of health to inspect it, and he had reported that it was no nuisance. If we had taken proceedings and produced our officer we would have been defeated.

7178. You would?—Certainly.

7179. I don't know any such thing if you put the question to me. I have heard a medical man say that it is no nuisance to have pigs dwelling in a house with human beings, but if they brought the matter before me, as a magistrate, I would exercise my common sense. Can you now tell me have you made any inquiry, since we were last here, as to what houses

through the township are connected with public sewers and what are not?—Mr. Johnston, our surveyor, has made a house to house inspection of Castlewood avenue, and I have had a list made out of all the houses in that avenue in which sewer openings were applied for, and out of fifty-three houses there were thirty-three that had sewer openings made. There are often double ones made for two houses.

7180. You have this farm in the country; how many hours a day in the year does it take you away?—It may be a few hours in a fortnight or in three weeks. I could not manage a farm from Duluth, a steward manager it for me.

7181. Dr. Forrested.—What is the extent of it?—A couple of hundred acres; it is managed by a steward, and not by myself at all.

7182. You go down there once a week?—No, indeed; very often not even in three weeks.

7183. Your Township annual income is between £9,000 and £10,000?—£11,000.

7184. You have never gone beyond a £2. rate?—2s. 4d.

7185. Your debt will be something between £60,000 and £70,000?—I don't acknowledge that.

7186. Twenty thousand is your debt at present?—Our water debt.

7187. What will be your main drainage debt?—I cannot tell you.

7188. Will it be £40,000?—It may be.

7189. CHAIRMAN.—I understand Mr. Hassard to say that it will cost £150,000 to finish it.

Witness.—A larger proportion of that will fall on Penobscot township than on Rathmines.

Mr. HENRY JOHNSTON examined.

7190. Mr. Monahan.—You are the township surveyor?—Yes.

7191. A statement has been made that in Castlewood avenue the communications between the houses and the main sewer are defective?—The statement made was that there were cesspools; I examined all the houses, and also asked both the inhabitants and the owners were there cesspools, and was informed that there were not, I could not find any. I found drains or sewers to every house, with gauging and traps outside.

7192. No cesspools?—Not that I am aware of, except I got the privilege of digging up mud and digging up the gardens; I have the word of the owners and the occupiers,

7193. And also your inspection as far as it could go?—Yes; allow me to say, with reference to Kentworth-square, that the proprietor, Mr. Murphy, asked, through his gardener, for some dry road scarpings as top-dressing. I was very cautious about it, and did not say anything until the Board met. He applied then for it, and there were some road scarpings put on; I did not say it was with my consent. It went on from that to time just as Mr. Bradley has stated. Mr. Murphy asked for the scarpings again, and he got them.

7194. Are they of any value?—I don't know; some people say they make manure if mixed with lime.

7195. Are they sold to practice money?—No, never in Rathmines.

7196. The object is to find some place to put them?—The nearest place; there is a depot, but when people call for it they get it. The journey is short, and saves so much hire of horses.

7197. Dr. Newbold.—With regard to Castlewood avenue did you ask Miss Gilman if she had a cesspool? What is the number of her house?—No. 24!—I did; I asked everyone—all the occupiers.

7198. What did she tell you?—She told me that she did not know of such a thing existing.

7199. Rev. Mr. Shine.—Did she mention to you any subsidence in the garden?—I did not go into the garden.

7200. Did she ask you?—No; not a word.

7201. CHAIRMAN.—How is her house drained?—There is a sewer to it, with a g�ting in the yard.

7202. A house drain to the main sewer?—To the main sewer.

7203. It is stated that information was given by the owner, Mr. Duggan; did he give you that information?—Is it James Duggan?

7204. Duggan is stated to have informed Mrs. Gilman that he could not say whether there was a cesspool or not, nor that he suspected there was!—I heard it said that there was a cesspool in one of those houses, but that it was filled up.

7205. Rev. Mr. Shine.—I said that when I lived in Castlewood avenue some of the houses had cesspools. I don't know how many were constructed.

7206. CHAIRMAN (to Witness).—Can you tell me the proportion of houses in the township that are drained into the main drains?—I don't know any that are not.

7207. This is not right, I asked Mr. Evans for information on the subject and he referred me to you and when I came to you for information you say you are not able to give it to me?—How can I tell?

7208. In other towns which the Commissioners visited, we had it proved by a house to house inspection which the officer had made, in order to ascertain the fact. I ask has that been done here? Mr. Evans says it is not his business and that it is yours, and I have asked you and you cannot tell!—I know that there are between 700 and 800 houses done under my own supervision.

7209. There are 3,000 houses in all!—That number represents holdings—all are not houses.

7210. There must be 3,000 houses!—I dare say there are.

7211. You are able to speak only of 700 or 800. Is there any human being in this great township who can tell whether that which has been carried out long ago in other smaller townships has been done in Rathmines?—These houses were built long before I had any connexion with the township.

7212. Exactly. Then the Public Health Act of

1846 stepped in and said that every house within 100 feet of a sewer should be compelled to drain into it and no longer into a cesspool; and that the Sanitary Authority should see that that was carried out, and serve notice on the parties calling on them to do it; and, if they would not do it make them pay the cost of its being done. I ask has any act in the township of Bathurst made a house to house inspection—such as has been carried out in Bay and other places—as to know how the houses drain there. Did and do they drain into cesspools? If they did did the Commissioners allowed them to break the law from 1846 down to the present time, if they were within a hundred feet of a public sewer. Who has looked after that? Mr. Evans says it was not part of his business as Executive Sanitary Officer, but surely the Commissioners should have seen that the law was transgressed with—all I know is that if I knew where there were any cesspools I would have them corrected at once.

7213. Rev. Mr. Shire.—Did you examine the north side of Belgrave-square?—Yes.

7214. Did you examine No. 54 there?—Every house along Castlewood Avenue.

7215. I mean the part of Castlewood Avenue facing Belgrave-square?—Yes.

7216. Did you examine any of those houses there?—Yes. I put in a large main sewer for the proprietors last season.

7217. Rev. Mr. Shire.—All I can tell you is that since our last meeting a lady in No. 54 complained to me of an offensive smell at the back of her house.

7218. —In seventeen cases out of twenty it is their own fault. The connection they make with the sewer may be what gives it.

7219. CHAIRMAN.—That is one of the very things the Public Health Act was passed to deal with—to have it seen by a house to house inspection that houses were not left in that state. The difference between 2,000 houses and 700 houses is 1,300, and with respect to those 1,300 houses there is no one to tell how many of them are now draining into cesspools directly contrary to the provisions of the Act of Parliament.

7220. Dr. Norwood.—Mr. Johnston you were examined on the 21st of May, and I find in your evidence on that day you stated that there was an abundant supply of water in the township?—Yes.

7220. A report of yours under the date of October, 1876, states that complaints were made by the inhabitants of the upper portion of the township of a deficiency of water supply to their premises, yet your evidence was that there was an abundant supply throughout the township. How do you explain the discrepancy?—There was an abundant supply at Gallowstow—so much as would do two townships, but the pipes are not large enough to bring it down. The pipes are always full such as they are.

7221. Are they full from nine o'clock in the evening until six in the morning in the upper portion of the township?—Yes, now. After the last meeting I made application to the Commissioners for permission to turn it on, and I got that permission and it is now on every night.

7222. You dwell, in your report on it as an objectionable matter?—The turning it off—decidedly.

7223. You state that the canal supply is defective and that there might be an interruption of it for a month?—That is correct. The waterworks are on the opposite side of the canal from the township, and a large pipe extends under the canal, eight feet deep.

7224. There would be an engineering difficulty in securing a supply if a barge should stop the canal?—No.

7225. How did you come to state that there was an abundant and satisfactory supply when this report was actually before the Commissioners?—I stated that there was an abundant supply, and I state the same thing yet. There is as much as would do.

7226. But not in the township. The question is

whether the supply to the township is satisfactory?—Does not my report state that it is not satisfactory?

7227. CHAIRMAN.—In your last evidence you never told us about the water being turned off at night at all—I was not asked.

7228. And on the contrary you said you were perfectly satisfied with the supply to the township.

7229. Dr. Norwood.—And that there were no complaints although there were complaints in October, 1876.

7230. CHAIRMAN.—The people were complaining of it over and over again, and not the slightest attention paid to them, and, as Dr. Norwood has pointed out, it was wholly illegal under the Act of 1847 to have shut off the water at night, and yet it was done.

7231. —I don't know about its being illegal, I know it was wrong.

7231. And yet you persisted against the wish of the people in going on with this wrong course. Do you accept the responsibility of the fire brigade?—Not at all. It is not a fire brigade at all.

7232. It is pitched from one to the other, I thought you would have had enough to do without the fire brigade, but Mr. Evans said—"I can give you no information, Mr. Johnston can"—I can give you the information. A man lives on the premises and has charge of the engine and it is always in very good order.

7233. Did you hear the gentleman's statement about the hose being full of holes?—That is an exaggeration Captain Ingram said that at the fire at Haworth's-cross the engine rendered very good service. The hose is not a bad one at all. It was made by Box of Abbey-street, and it is a new hose. If a fire occurs in the neighbourhood, the bell is rung by the man in the yard, and the engine goes out and we get plenty of willing hands and pay them a shilling or half-a-crown each according to the time they are occupied.

7234. Dr. Norwood.—At what time do you go to business in the township?—I generally begin at six o'clock in the morning and I am sometimes not done until twelve at night.

7235. What time are you occupied with your private business?—I have little or no private business at present.

7236. But you had!—Oh yes many a time. I built some houses for myself and friends.

7237. CHAIRMAN.—Was there ever an arrangement with you as to the time?—The township was much smaller when I began than it is now, and I got a small salary and was not prevented from doing anything I could. I was allowed to build some private houses.

7238. Is there any place where the Commissioners keep sand or stones?—No, we get it by contract. It is a great mistake to store stone. It is expensive, you pay for the delivery of it in the yard or depot, and have afterwards to pay for the drawing of it out.

7239. What check have you on the amount of stone delivered and how it is used?—We have no fear of being robbed. We get stone from the Shanks Hill quarry. They come by railway at so much a ton. When the stone goes out in carts it is loaded by the contractor, and we get dockets sent by the Railway Clerk who weighs them. Sometimes we check it with our own scales.

7240. Then have you a yard for yourself?—We have sheds, stables, and yard.

7241. Is there a clerk, or stockkeeper, or anyone to keep time for all the men?—That is kept very well by myself and Mr. Smith.

7242. Is there a regular book kept for it?—Yes, a wages book containing every man's wages.

7243. Showing where he had been during the day?—No, that is not shown, we can show the quantity of scarpings taken off and the quantity of staff taken out of the lines and all that. The contractor's monthly bill is the return for stone.

7244. Who is the contractor?—Mr. Woollington.

7245. What is his contractor for?—For broken stone,

Before
July 1, 1878.
Mr. Henry
Johnstone

DRAKES,
July 1, 1873.
Mr. Henry
Johnston,

7246. If there be no book kept how can you tell what check you have on the men?—We have a book and every man is put down in it in the evening, and his work is made up next morning.

7247. I asked was there any such book sent in to the Commissioners and Mr. Evans could tell me nothing about it and referred me to you!—They have a book that shows every man's work and his wages.

7248. Dr. Newstead.—How often have you been to Gallantstown?—I think I was there three times during the last month.

7249. Is the filter bed in proper order?—In capital order.

7250. How many filter beds are there?—Six.

7251. Have you got any new filter beds recently?—No.

7252. CHAIRMAN.—What would you say was the increase in the men's wages for the township during the last eight or ten years?—We have had no increase at all. We pay them the same thing now.

7253. Rev. Mr. Shire.—They get less done now.

7254. Dr. Newstead.—Has there been any increase of activity in the township since the Commissioners sat here last?—Not that I am aware of.

7255. Has there been more done?—Nothing more than usual.

7256. CHAIRMAN.—In one of the reports they say "notwithstanding the increased cost of labour, by rigid economy, &c."—Increased economy has been adopted. No one knows that better than I do.

7257. Rev. Mr. Shire.—With respect to Castlewood avenue what sanitary arrangements have been made?—There is no sewer in it.

7258. Is there any means of carrying the surface water away?—Nothing except a channel.

7259. Where does it go to?—Out into the avenue. There is a small sewer below at the end of it, that takes the drainage away.

7260. Is it an open sewer?—No there is a grating.

7261. Where does it go to?—It goes into a large main drain there.

7262. Was it lately put there?—My father made it about the year 1835.

7263. The people all about it complain that they have none!—I don't mind that, I am used to that.

7264. What about Chancery Lane?—There is a sewer in it which goes under the fields.

7265. What communication is there from the lane?—A grating.

President.
Wright

FRENCHECK WRIGHT examined.

7267. Dr. Newstead.—Where is your report book?

7268. Mr. Johnston—I am not aware that these report books were pointed at, but we will have them here in the morning.

7269. CHAIRMAN (to witness).—What office do you fill?—Porter and messenger to the Commissioners, and sub-sanitary inspector.

7270. From that you get £15 a year, and 1d. a week?—Yes.

7271. What time do you give to the duties of messenger and porter?—My office hours are from ten till four.

7272. At the Town Hall?—Yes.

7273. When can you attend to your sanitary work—surely you can't do it after 4 o'clock in the dark winter nights?—Not in the dark winter nights. I do it sometimes before the office opens.

7274. Is it twenty-two miles of streets?—Oh, I could not go over twenty-two miles every day.

7275. Are you bound to work daily in your office from ten till four?—Yes.

7276. Mr. Evans, what do you say to that? I understand you to say he was not there, or bound to be there?

Mr. Evans—I did not say that—excuse me, I said he never was out of the house.

7265. Where?—Near the fountain.

7266. And it carries off everything?—It does.

7267. The drainage of all the houses?—All pass by that sewer.

7268. Dr. Newstead—I gather from your answers to the Commissioners that, in your opinion, in order to carry out the management of the township, as far as your department is concerned, a larger rate would be necessary?—I would rather have a larger one.

7269. Isn't that the meaning of your answer that right economy has been exercised?—There has been great economy, no doubt of it.

7270. Couldn't you improve the footpath and crossings if you had a larger rate?—Give me the money and I will soon do it.

7271. Would a larger rate be sufficient to enable it to be done?—Yes; but sinking a larger rate happens to be outside my province.

7272. But if you were asked your opinion as town surveyor by your Commissioners you would say that they ought to give you more money, and you would do the work better?—I could do a great many things that I can't do now.

7273. CHAIRMAN.—In 1875 they were not so angry with the Corporation, for they felt bound to support them in their transaction about the main drainage I see, Mr. Evans, that in 1875 you were heavily in debt. You must have used great economy then.

Mr. Evans.—It was not by economy that it was done. The increase in our valuation, the decrease in the Grand Jury charges, and the bounty that we received from Government, all helped us materially. The increase in the valuation in 1875 was £3,500 a year."

7274. Rev. Mr. Shire.—The Commissioners say in their report for 1873 that they "exercise every economy, in order to utilise the £2 rate to the utmost of their ability, but the task is one of increasing difficulty, as the cost of materials and labour has steadily advanced, their workmen having received another increase in their wages during the current year."

7275. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Johnston that in their report for 1872, and they call attention in it to the difficulty of trying to keep within a £2 rate, on account of the increased cost of labour, &c. Just now you said cost of labour had not increased?—I think they paid 2s. a week more about that time.

7276. CHAIRMAN.—If he is not out of the house in the day, how can he act as sub-sanitary officer in a district of that kind. There was nobody else but himself until 1879. (To witness.) How long have you been filling the office of hall porter?—Going on twenty-three years.

7277. Have your office hours been the same during that time?—Yes.

7278. Who did the sanitary work prior to Mr. Smith's appointment?—I am not aware that Mr. Smith ever did it.

7279. Mr. McEvoy, I mean. Who was there to do any sanitary work before Mr. McEvoy?—I was.

7280. What hours led you to do it?—I did it after hours, or sometimes in the middle of the day.

7281. Isn't it dark at four o'clock in the winter, and dark up to eight o'clock in the morning. What time had you to do it if you were obliged to be in your office at ten?—Well, it was done, and done perfectly, and I can certify to that.

7282. It has been stated over and over again that there were nuisances and offensive matters reported, and that you were sent to have them rectified. Is that so?—And you make written reports every day?—Not every day. I could not on some days. Whenever I found a nuisance I reported it to the doctor, and according to his certificate I would go.

7294. Do you say that whenever a nuisance was reported were sent to examine it?—Yes.

7295. Was not that reverting the order of things if you did not do anything until a complaint was made to the Commissioners?

7296. Dr. *Norwood*.—Are you the disinfectant?—I am, but there was so little disease that there was nothing to disinfect.

7297. Were't there ten cases this year?—I am not doing it this year.

7298. When was the last that you disinfected?—There was nothing done this year. It must have been last year.

7299. CHAIRMAN.—What time in the day did you disinfect?—In the morning or in the afternoon.

7300. Dr. *Norwood*.—Do you know that the Dublin Corporation sent out disinfectors to different parts?—I heard so.

7301. Do you know it?—I only heard it. I never saw it. I got information that the cases existed, and I went to the places, and was told that Mr. Boyle had done the work. That is all I know.

7302. Have you charge of the fire engines?—I had formerly.

7303. Who has it now?—A man named Henry in the yard.

7304. Does he stop always in the yard?—Yes.

7305. Is he resident in the place?—He is.

7306. Is he bell-ringer?—He is.

7307. CHAIRMAN.—What is he?—He is connected with the water.

7308. I understood that Smith was the man who had charge of the water main?—He is the head. Henry is assistant to him.

7309. Does anyone look after the mills supplied in Rathmines?—Yes; I bought thirteen samples.

7310. When?—Last month to Dr. Cameron.

7311. Was it ever done before?—Yes, constantly and heavy fines inflicted.

7312. Rev. Mr. *Shire*.—All that I can say is, that I brought the question of the quality of the milk supplied to me before them, and they told me that it was too troublesome to look after, and that they did not interfere.

Witness.—Well, if I get word of it I would take the sample and bring it to Dr. Cameron.

7313. CHAIRMAN.—Is it your duty to look after the milk?—It is.

7314. But don't you see you are not likely to get word of it, and if you did it would do no good?—If any gentleman made a complaint,

7315. You should go into the dairies when they don't expect you, and take a sample bottle of milk and divide it into three parts. If they suspected that you were coming there, they would have the watered stuff away?

7316. But sir, I have done that up to the present and within the last month.

7317. Dr. *Norwood*.—Did you disinfect premises and then go on delivering your letters?—The disinfecting was never done until the afternoons, and then I did not go to the office.

7318. What disinfectant did you use?—That is a question I cannot answer.

7319. You had some?—I am instructed by the Doctor, and by him I go.

7320. Did you ever see whether the scavenging men attended to their duty or left nuisances on the road?—If I were passing by and drew attention to it, they would have it done at once.

7321. CHAIRMAN.—If you sat in your office from ten to four, it would be rather hard to expect that you should turn out at four o'clock in the afternoon to

look after such matters. I am afraid that you would have very little time to do it in the winter months?—Well, I do my best.

7322. It would be better for them to give you a good salary. Do you know anything at all of how the houses drain?—I do. They drain principally into the main sewer.

7323. How many do?—I could not say how many.

7324. Mr. Johnston was able to speak of 700 houses; can you speak of the remaining 2,300?—I have been employed as sanitary inspector for a long time, and in no instance have I heard of a cesspool in Rathmines, except one.

7325. Mr. Johnston can only speak of 700 houses out of 3,000. He says that 700 drain into the sewers, but he can't tell where the rest drain into?—They may drain into back premises.

7326. What I want to know is where do they drain? They all have drainage, but where they drain into, is the question. Did you ever go from house to house and say—"I am the sanitary officer, and have come to look after your drains." Don't you know that is part of your duty? You could hardly do that between four o'clock in the evening and bed-time.

7327. Rev. Mr. *Shire*.—The examination made was the most cursory thing possible.

7328. CHAIRMAN.—There has been no examination at all. Mr. Johnston does not pretend that he made any examination. He says it is no part of his business I have not heard anyone say that it is, except Mr. Evans.

7329. Dr. *Norwood* (to Witness).—Did you ever see where the houses on the west side of Rathgar-road drain into?—I never heard a single complaint of any one.

7330. Rev. Mr. *Shire*.—Is there a cesspool in Zion-road?—There is.

7331. CHAIRMAN.—Are the houses that have this cesspool close to main drains?—No.

7332. How near are they?—More than 100 feet.

7333. Did you measure it?—I knew the distance very well.

7334. Have you examined the cesspools to see that they are in proper order?—I had them examined in one instance where there was a cesspool on Zion-road, and I found it was in perfect working order—caveted in, and everything else.

7335. I see that a report was sent in by a resident of Zion-road as to the condition of the drainage of his house on Zion-road. Did you examine all the rest of the houses?—No, I did not. I examined that and found it all right.

7336. The sanitary officer was directed to report on it?—That is not so.

7337. Dr. *Norwood*.—Did you tell that gentleman (the Town Clerk) that there was no map of the sewers?

7338. Town Clerk.—About two years ago.

7339. Dr. *Norwood*.—That there was no map still did you ever tell him that?—About two years ago I told him there was no map.

7340. CHAIRMAN.—Is there any map except that which has been made this year?—There is the township map.

7341. No, but a map showing all the sewers, and waterpipes, and so on?—Not that I am aware of.

7342. You say that the thing is not in existence. They were bound to have a map showing the course of all the existing sewers, and drains, and lines of water and gaspipes, and it has not been done. (To Mr. *Moshaa*).

—Do you wish to examine anyone else on the part of the Rathmines Commissioners?

Mr. *Moshaa*.—No.

24848.
July 1, 1873.

Frederick
Wrigg

D. G. S.
July 1, 1879
Mr. Wm. G.
Bradley.

MR. WILLIAM G. BRADLEY RE-EXAMINED.

7343. On the last occasion that I was here I complained of the state of the lane at the rear of the south side of Kemilworth-square. I complained of the manner in which that lane was kept, the contents of ash-pits being allowed to remain there for a considerable time. Mr. Evans stated that the Commissioners had charge of that lane, and that it was then in perfect order. You asked me how long it was since I was in that lane, and at that time I gave myself a latitude of at all events about a month. On the following evening I walked down to the lane with my son and a friend, and found that a more shameful condition in a sanitary point of view could not be exhibited than the condition of that lane.

7344. MR. MORASDEN.—Which is it?

Witness.—The lane at the rear of the south side of Kemilworth-square where all the stables are.

7345. MR. MORASDEN.—This is not the one we have been speaking of just now?

Witness.—No, it is not, but it is the one we were speaking of on a former occasion. We were here on the Saturday that you broke up. On the following Sunday the 27th of May, I went down this lane from one end of it to the other. I admit that for about 200 yards down it looked all right; but from that down which was some hundreds of yards a more disgraceful exhibition could not have been seen. Within two or three yards of my own stable there were the contents of ash-pits, which, certainly, from their appearance, must have been there for a considerable time; and there was a whole lot of vegetable matter. I continued my progress down the entire lane, and have only to state that several ash-pits had been emptied into it. In the centre of the lane there was some stagnant water. There is a deep gullet in the centre and the water in it was quite green and had an offensive smell. I called my son and my friend to witness it, and stated that it had been reported to you the day before that the lane was in perfect order.

7346. CHAIRMAN.—Certainly.

Witness.—Now I challenge contradiction to what I have stated.

7347. Has it been cleaned since?—I was not in it since.

7348. Was it then in the same condition it was in before?—Yes.

7349. A couple of months before?—Certainly.

7350. I know that within the last fortnight the magistrates of Dublin have been fining people for depositing ash-pit stuff in the streets and lanes. Mr. Evans did your men repeat that the lane was in perfect order?

Mr. Evans.—He reported that there was no nuisance in the houses that he inspected.

7351. If he gave such a report to you the Commissioners ought to know how to deal with him.

Witness.—I should be very sorry indeed to injure anybody but what I have stated is the fact, and I shall bring my son and my medical friend in the morning to confirm it.

7352. Has there been any improvement in the township within the last month?

Witness.—Certainly, they are putting gravel on the walks, but it is too fine, I think the appearance of the township is better in consequence of the Commissioners having got a little raking up, they are anxious to put a good appearance forward. I heard what Mr. Stokes said to day, with regard to his interference at elections, and really was surprised at his remarks for he was then the factorum of the district and anything that he said was law. He was the man that did everything, and anything. He was there at the time the election at which I was a candidate was held, and he certainly in every way exercised his influence.

7353. DR. NEWTON.—And you saw his circulars?—I did. I got circulars from the Board myself.

7354. CHAIRMAN.—From the Commissioners?—

emanating from the Board. I saw the clerks at work in the Commissioners' Office with a large pile of circulars and this was all going on in aid of the candidates, and I believe it will not be contradicted that the collectors were employed there.

7355. WAS MR. DUGGAN?—Yes.

7356. MR. MORASDEN.—Mr. Duggan wasn't. He left to answer for himself. I have stated already that Mr. Saunders was engaged by the outgoing Commissioners to direct these circulars and he did it in the office.

7357. Who paid for them?

MR. EVANS.—The candidates. I don't know. The authorities would not pass the account if anything was wrong.

7358. REV. MR. SHIRE.—Who kept the accounts of the candidates in the election—for instance—of 1877. Who kept the accounts in reference to the expenditure of the candidates?

7359. MR. MORASDEN.—Mr. Bolton got the accounts together, and asked me to have them paid.

7360. What right had Mr. Bolton to do that?—He sent them prepared, cut and dry to me, and gave me a cheque, and asked me to have them paid.

7361. REV. MR. SHIRE.—In order to show the influence of Mr. Stokes on that occasion, I may mention, that he stated to several of the electors that the rates in Penrake township were considerably higher than they were in Rathmines township, and I was obliged to go home and bring down a receipt in order to show him that his statement was not well founded.

7362. MR. MORASDEN.—Why were those circulars sent to the Town Hall at all?

MR. MORASDEN.—Mr. Saunders was asked to direct them, and he has an office there.

7363. They must have come from some place to the Town Hall. Who ordered them?—Mr. Bolton, and the other candidates.

7364. MR. BRADLEY says, he saw the circulars emanating from the Board?—They never did.

7365. MR. BRADLEY.—Mr. Evans, have you not enclosed those circulars yourself?

MR. MORASDEN.—No, never.

7366. MR. BRADLEY.—I have got letters from the Board.

MR. MORASDEN.—Mr. Bradley never got letters from the Board in reference to the election, emanating from the Board.

7367. MR. BRADLEY.—Not emanating from the Board but it came from the Town Hall.

7368. MR. MORASDEN.—You mean that they were sent from the Town Hall?

MR. BRADLEY.—I have got the circulars signed by the candidates.

7369. CHAIRMAN.—Mr. Evans do you agree with this answer of Mr. Murphy?—

"For instance, the majority of the members are men with large holdings, but there is always a certain amount of seats reserved for gentlemen who have an interest in the township beyond the houses they occupy or pay rack-rent for. It has always been considered fair that the occupiers should have representation. We always admit that some three or four not having property in the township, should represent the occupiers."

Is that correct?

MR. MORASDEN.—I don't understand the meaning of the word "reserved" there. The Board could not possibly reserve a seat.

7370. They could not, but it is said their influence is such that they could allow in outsiders.

MR. MORASDEN.—Except in case of death, or disqualification.

7371. He says—"We always admit that there shall be so many to represent the occupiers"—and in answer to my question—"Do the ratepayers adopt the members proposed by the Board?"—he says—"Yes they have allowed everything the Commissioners did, in fact."

Mr. Stokes.—The Board have no choice only by co-operation.

7372. They don't co-opt three or four at a time!—They do not.

7373. You see what he says!—**Mr. Stokes** has already given evidence. I don't care about Mr. Murphy.

7374. **Alderman Harris.**—Does Mr. Stokes agree with Mr. Murphy?

Mr. Stokes.—He does not.

7375. **Mr. Bentley.**—There is a letter stating that the addresses of Mr. Bentley, Mr. Brown, and Mr. Askin were brought before the Board, and that the Board gave response to them.

BOSTON.
July 1, 1879.

7376. **Mr. Monahan.**—We are agreed that certain circulars of the candidates were addressed from the Town Hall.

7377. **Rev. Mr. Shire.**—And that a large number of the Board canvassed from day to day.

7378. **Mr. Monahan.**—That does not appear.

7379. **Rev. Mr. Ahern.**—I have stated it next that they brought up voters. I have been canvassed personally and by letter.

7380. **Mr. Bradley.**—Will you have my son as a witness.

7381. **CHAIRMAN.**—Certainly—if you wish it.

The inquiry was then adjourned to the following day.

DUBLIN—FOURTEENTH DAY, 2ND JULY, 1879.

Mr. F. Stokes, re-examined.

July 2, 1879.

Mr. F. Stokes.

7382. **CHAIRMAN.**—I believe, Mr. Stokes, you wish to make some further statement—I wish to correct two misapprehensions which I see have been made of my evidence of yesterday. In the first place, in reference to my interference in elections; it has been assumed, I see, that I denied having interfered at all, but my disavowal was entirely confined to the one day upon which the occurrence which was spoken of occurred. At all times when I have been in this country my habit has been to use all the influence I had in favour of the outgoing candidates, and I should like to say publicly, as I have said privately, in reference to Mr. Bentley, that upon no occasion have I interfered with reference to his candidature except in his favour. The other point is with regard to the paper I handed in. It has been described as containing the views of the Board. That paper was written in Southport without consultation with anyone. No one saw it until it was in print. It represents my views and my views alone, and has never been seen by a member of the Board. I directed it to be printed in order that the members might become acquainted with it.

7383. **The Rev. Mr. Shire.**—My statement was objected to because it was made in the absence of Mr. Stokes. May I ask him one or two questions with reference to the year 1877? It is very important to me, as a theologian, that I should have answers from him as to the statements I have made.

7384. **CHAIRMAN.**—What Mr. Shire says, Mr. Stokes, is that during that election you were that day representing to the people that the Pembroke taxes were much higher than those in Rathmines—as he suggests, with a view of showing the people what good the Rathmines Board were doing for them, as compared with the Pembroke Board!—To the best of my recollection I never mentioned to any one what the Pembroke practice was, and if I did, I represented it correctly to the best of my knowledge.

7385. **Dr. Narveson.**—What do you think of the principle adopted with regard to the circulars to the ratepayers, asking their opinion as to annexation—in those questions, do you think it the proper thing to inquire from the ratepayers their views?—If I had been Chairman of the Board, I would not have done that because, I think the Board are the ratepayers and their opinion is the opinion of the ratepayers. If I had any doubt about the opinion of the ratepayers such a course might be advisable, but there should be no doubt.

7386. Was it upon that principle that you declined to ascertain the views of the ratepayers with regard to the water question?—Certainly, when Mr. Bentley proposed that I give it as my opinion, that the Board were the elected representatives of and represented the opinions of the people.

7387. And so to do would have been subversive of proper representation!—I think so.

7388. **CHAIRMAN.**—Then you disagree with the view of the counsel for Rathmines, who commented on the

fact that the Corporation did not produce a single citizen to speak in favour of or to back up their views. He said, that if they only brought the members of the Corporation, they did not represent the citizens on this occasion at all, and that they had not brought forward a single citizen to express his views, except Mr. Pim. Therefore from that he would argue, that inasmuch as the Corporation do not represent the citizens, we are left in this dilemma, that no single citizen pronounces in favour of annexation!—That is rather a long and difficult question to answer.

7389. The Corporation produce no witness except Mr. Pim. The Corporation say, "We represent the citizens, therefore we don't want to ask the citizens because we represent them." If the Corporation represents the citizens do you think the like view holds good with reference to Rathmines?—No question of it. The Corporation want to plunder us and we don't want to be plundered. If I was a member of the Corporation, I would go in for annexation with all my might. They want to "do" us and we don't want to be "done."

7390. May I ask now, as you are opposed to annexation, upon what ground?—I put it fully on the paper already referred to both from a citizen's point of view and from the township point of view.

7391. Would the fact of the Corporation being perfectly solvent have any effect on your opinion?—Not a bit; nor would it be a bit better if they were a better Corporation than they are.

7392. Because Mr. Walker, in opening the case for Rathmines, said that the principal objection to annexation was that it would be uniting beggary to prosperity. He described the Corporation as being in a state of beggary or poverty, and he said that it would be most unfair that the Rathmines people should be taken in on the ground that they were in a state of prosperity. Supposing that the city was not in a state of beggary, would that alter your opinion?—I think if you will read the paper I have alluded to, you will see my views as to that. With regard to the last question, it does apply in this sense: of the taxes within the Corporation jurisdiction only 20 per cent. are paid. Therefore if we paid 10% they would only pay 4%. In that sense it would be uniting insolvency with prosperity. It is was only a federal union that might be obviated. At present the Rathmines Commissioners get the rates to the last penny and no less. The Corporation, and that is a bitter curse of their embarrassment, only get 90 per cent and not even that.

7393. **Dr. Narveson.**—You have not been in Dublin for some time: are you aware that since the appointment of the present Collector-General a very great change for the better has taken place in the amount of the collection?—Yes, I am aware of that.

7394. And that 90 per cent by no means represents the percentage of the collections at present!—Quite so, but I reply to your observation by saying that there is one difficulty which the Corporation have,

BEXHILL,
July 5, 1878.
Mr. F. Stokes.

and which is one that no Collector-General could get over, for instance all unoccupied houses have to pay in the township, and rightly so.

7393. Supposing legislation takes place and deals with that question in that direction, that gets rid of that objection!—Yes. In my paper I have given details and I have pointed out that many of these things could be remedied by legislation. That is one of them.

7394. Do you adhere to the opinion you expressed to the Committee of the House of Commons that the property in Rotherham is under-valued!—Over-valued—that is notorious.

7395. I gathered from what you have said that you have been resident at Southport. I have a return here from the Town Clerk of that borough in which he states that the extension of the boundaries of the borough of Southport took place, and that the townships round about it opposed. Are you aware that the extension took place against the wishes of the township, and has been satisfactory to all parties?—Yes. You are incorrectly informed, because the township is in the same category as Rotherham and Dublin. They used to swallow the township and failed, and the township is independent. They touch on our independence now. I am not familiar, at any rate, with Southport, but I know, in point of fact, that it is an independent township.

MR. W. D. BRADLEY, examined.

7404. DR. NORELL.—Do you recollect this lane behind the south side of Ecclesworth-square?—I do.

7405. Do you recollect going with your father to it lately—in May?—Yes; on one Sunday evening, the night after the inquiry here.

7406. In what condition did you find it?—It was perfectly clean down to about 150 or 200 yards, at which point this stable lane takes a turn and the road is not visible from the approach to it. The rest of this lane was in a disgraceful condition and there was a quantity of the refuse of sal-pits within about ten yards of our stable door.

7407. Had it the appearance of having been cleaned for a long time?—Not for a considerable time.

7408. Was that visible to any one?—Yes; to any one that went down beyond the turn.

7409. CHAIRMAN.—M'EVERY only went down the lane to the turn and found it clean, but if he had gone down the other way he would have found it filthy!—Yes; and there were a number of pools of stagnant water there.

7410. MR. EVERETT.—There is no sewer in that lane.

7411. CHAIRMAN.—If it is a public thoroughfare, why have not the Rotherham Commissioners made one? MR. EVERETT.—It is not a public thoroughfare; it is a stable lane.

7412. Is it not an open stable lane?—Yes.

7413. Then why have not the Commissioners had a sewer made there? They are empowered to take a sewer rate to any amount independent of any other rate!—I don't know anything about that.

7414. MR. M. C. BRADLEY.—I wish to correct a statement made by Mr. Stokes. He was under a mistake in saying that no gentleman who signed the requisition attended the meeting.

MR. JAMES ROBERT STEWART examined.

7415. CHAIRMAN.—I believe, Mr. Stewart, you wish to make a statement in reference to the County Grand Jury?—Yes, I attended here on the part of the County Grand Jury, and I wish to say that at their last meeting their attention was called by a letter from your Committee to the effect that the Commission was sitting touching this matter. The Grand Jury did not go into the general matter at all, but they referred it to the Finance Committee to make such a report as they should find consistent with the figures and facts, as to the financial disadvantage, which, unless remedied, they consider would cause them to object to the annexation scheme as proposed.

7416. Were you aware that evidence has been given here to show that the entire debt of the Corporation is £830,000 or round numbers, and that the estate of the Corporation would, if sold to-morrow, discharge £750,000?—I could not answer that question.

7390. In your examination before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, at question 345, you are made to say, in answer to question from Sir Joseph M'Kenzie, that in your opinion you would not say that Rotherham would be found considerably below the city, if revalued.

7409. Then it is under-valued!—As compared with the city it is over-valued.

7410. That is the very thing. In what proportion?—One half.

7411. You still think that the township is one half over-valued?—Yes; I am certain of it. I had a house in the county for which I paid £140 a year. As years go on the valuation increases in the county, while in the city it sticks fast.

7412. That is a matter, however, that is adjustable by legislation!—Yes; it would be a question for Parliament. Everything in my paper I am prepared to swear to, and it contains all that I want to put forward on the subject.

7415. CHAIRMAN.—That is in reference to the audit?—Yes; I attended the meeting myself, and also eight gentlemen who signed the requisition. Mr. Stokes was in the chair, and I heard him move the resolution, and Mr. Foster second it. The only notice, of course, that the ratepayers got was the public notice in the newspapers. That was all overcast, but we know, of course, that many gentlemen do not read those advertisements. There were eight gentlemen there, for I counted them. I therefore wish to correct that statement of Mr. Stokes's. I also wish to say—with regard to the evidence given by Mr. Gray and Mr. Brett, that I have an intimate knowledge of the township for more than eighteen years, and there is no gentleman in the township over it older than I am, and I can without any hesitation say that there has been more work done in the township for the last three months in sowing and graveling than for the previous twelve months. Of course Mr. Gray and Mr. Brett saw the township in its best colour, but not in its normal or ordinary condition. I may mention in reference to the inspection of Brighton square.

7416. MR. NEWMAN.—I can tell you are in a position to completely disprove that—that Mr. Bentley is under a mistake. The only reason I intervene is to suggest that I understood the inquiry, so far as Rotherham is concerned, had closed.

7417. CHAIRMAN.—You see, Mr. Bentley, they say they can prove that there was no more done in the last three months than during any ordinary quarter of the twelve months!—I have a most intimate knowledge of the township, and I maintain what I have stated. However, as you seem to think this new matter I will say no more than that even since we last sat a great deal has been done.

Mr. HENRY BAKER examined.

DEBATE.
July 2, 1872.
Mr. H. Baker

7430. CHAIRMAN.—Was there a report of the Financial Committee of the Grand Jury actually made?—No.

7431. Would you then kindly let us have the views of the Grand Jury on the subject?—I appear here as Secretary to the Grand Jury merely to state that the Grand Jury offer no objection whatever to annexation if their rights which exist at present are preserved. That is that the townships generally, which now comprise in point of value half the county, are liable to all county charges—that is county-at-large charges—for which they are liable to their proportion according to their valuation.

7432. And that they should be liable in future as they are now?—Exactly.

7433. With regard to the portions outside the townships that are now in the county, and which the Corporation propose to take in, such as Dolphin's Barn?—Yes, that amounts to £19,000 a year.

7434. Do the Grand Jury object to its being annexed either with the township to the city, or to the township to which it more naturally from its situation belongs, provided it is made to pay its proportion of the county-at-large charges?—No.

7435. You propose that whatever body get such portions should take charge of and keep up the roads, and that they should have to pay their proportion of the county-at-large charges, just as the townships do at present?—Certainly.

7436. On that understanding—that the law would be arranged in that way the Grand Jury would have no objection that they should be annexed either with the townships to the city, or to the townships themselves?—They would have no objection under those circumstances.

7437. It was on that principle that their attention was called to the fact of the valuation of the townships, compared with that of the county?—Yes. It shows how important it is to the rest of the county, and the injustice that would follow if the taxation that exists at present was spread over the limited area that would remain.

7438. It would raise the present taxation enormously?—Yes.

7439. We have not heard any expression of opinion as to making any alteration in the taxation in the townships as it exists at present—given the county-at-large charges?—Quite so; but of course the Grand Jury thought that if it was nothing else than out of respect for the communication they received from the Commissioners they would desire to be represented here.

7440. Do you send in the warrant for the county-at-large charges?—Yes, to the different townships.

7441. Is there any portion of the County Surveyor's salary included in that?—No; they are exempt. They are struck out of the amount before it is put on.

7442. Then you say that on that valuation of £19,000 a year on which you get your county rates at present—if that was annexed and only paid its proportion of the county-at-large charges, the same as the townships, the rest of the county would have to pay the whole of the County Surveyor's charges?—Of course they would still have to remain the same, but I don't think the Grand Jury would object to that, because they have

admitted the principle, and I don't think they would object to it.

7443. As Secretary to the Grand Jury, may I ask you what your opinion that the district proposed to be brought in—Milltown and all the adjoining places up along there (pointing to map)—derives exceptional value and benefit from its proximity to the township and to the city, and from the people getting light, and everything provided up to their own door—is it your opinion that they do?—That they have exceptional advantages?

7444. Yes?—Certainly.

7445. And therefore that it would not be unfair that they should contribute something towards the cost of that benefit, either by being brought into the township or in some other way?—Yes, I think it is on that principle that the Grand Jury would accede to the annexation of those districts. They would never raise an objection if the proportion comprised within the township were still to remain a constituent part of the county, given the county-at-large charges.

7446. Would it derive additional advantage from being taken into the township?—No doubt of it.

7447. Would the gentlemen living there derive additional advantage from the township being brought up to their own door?—Yes, certainly.

7448. Dr. Norman.—Don't you think the townships having the advantages of the hospital and other accommodation in the city, should be fairly called upon to contribute to the city charges?—It is outside my province to express any opinion as to that. If you wish to have my private opinion I have no hesitation in saying that it would be a desirable thing, that the townships should be annexed to the city.

7449. I may take it that you speak as the representative of the Grand Jury, in that respect?—As far as I can represent the Grand Jury I have represented their views. There was no opinion given on the general question; we wished merely to confine ourselves to a consideration of the question, from a financial point of view.

7450. Mr. Monahan.—You own no property in the township?—No, I do not.

7451. Then you are a disinterested witness at all events?—I hold property in the city.

7452. CHAIRMAN.—As the Secretary to the Grand Jury, and knowing the district, of course, outside Pembroke and outside Rathmines, is there anything that you are aware of in the Pembroke township that would warrant them in spending 3s. 4d., and that would warrant Rathmines in spending only 2s.? Is there anything exceptional in one district as compared with the other, to warrant that difference in the rating—do you know anything?—I am not sufficiently conversant with the township to give any opinion upon that.

7453. Mr. Allen.—As the Secretary to the Grand Jury, may I ask you do you think that the Grand Jury would have any objection to the annexation of Clontarf to the city?—I should say not. I should think that the Clontarf township, as regards the Grand Jury, is similarly circumstanced to any other township.

7454. And the ruling of the Grand Jury would remain the same for it?—Yes, certainly.

Mr. MICHAEL GANLEY examined.

Mr. M. Ganley.

7455. CHAIRMAN.—You live in Dublin?—I am a property owner in the city, and also in the Pembroke township, in both of which I have built and have my entire interest.

7456. What is your view with regard to annexation?—I am entirely against annexation, and for this reason: I am a resident of the South Dock Ward for the last forty years, during which time I would say,

at a rough calculation, there have been 400 rated habitations erected. I made a calculation ten years ago, and I discovered 403, and I am quite sure they have increased to 600 since. Within that forty years there have been but three crossings erected in that entire district—two in Brunswick-street, one at Grand Canal-street, and that within the last twelve or eighteen months. The roads are impassable.

DUBLIN,
July 9, 1878.
Mr. M. Gandy.

7447. Are these in the custody of the Corporation?—Yes.

7448. Then how would Pembroke township being added alter that?—It has nothing to say to that.

7449. As a ratepayer of Pembroke township would you object to annexation?—I would most certainly. I am owner of twelve houses in the Pembroke township, all of which I built myself, and being an owner of property in the city, I have just as much interest in the city in which I have also built.

7450. It would not injure the Pembroke people the fact of whether there were crossings in Brunswick-street or not?—No, but it is an indication of what might be expected—that the Pembroke property would be neglected in the same way as the city property is neglected.

7451. What you are afraid of is, that the Pembroke property if it got into the hands of the Corporation would be as badly managed as you say the city property is now?—Just so.

7452. Are you satisfied with the management of the Pembroke township?—Yes, with the exception of the working of some of the departments which is much inferior to the working of the Dublin Corporation. I do them the credit to say so. I am not a favourite with some of the officers because I am so blunt, and they treated me badly as to supplying water to six of my houses. I may also tell you, to show how things are managed in the township, that there are a few of the Commissioners who attend frequently, and their word is the entire law, and whatever they decide on is carried out. I happen to own houses in Bushfield-terrace. It is a new avenue—one mile of it with a channel course and kerbed with stones, and houses had been erected upon it, and preparation had been made to give it up to the township. It was ankle-deep with mud, and I applied to have it cleaned, and some macadam put upon it, and I was told that it not having been given up in proper order they would not attend to it. I thought that correct until I found that another avenue—Sandymount-avenue—which never had a channel course, pathway, or kerbing, and I find that a main sewer has been put there at the expense of the ratepayers—and why? Because a Commissioner owns property adjacent to it.

7453. What other complaint have you to make of the Corporation?—I have already given you to understand that I have been a ratepayer for the ward I have spoken of for forty years, and since that time we have got three crossings. The arches are perfectly impassable at the present time. We have complained repeatedly—time after time—of the trickling of the nasty water from above.

7454. Is that at the railway?—Yes. The Corporation won't do anything. They say it is the duty of the ratepayers to summon the railway authorities, but we look upon them as the city fathers, and think they should take action. That has not been attended to. All the roads passing there on a line with Sandymount-street to the Canal bridge and thence onwards to the south side of the city are now perfectly impassable. It would be cruelty to animals to expect a man to lead his horses through some of them, for I suppose he would stick in the mud at the present time. The Corporation have totally neglected their duty in that ward, simply because they considered that the ward was "nobody's child."

7455. You said things were better managed in Pembroke?—Yes; but I say they are more honest and honourable in the Corporation than are the Commissioners of the Pembroke township. I would like to have the members of the press brought in.

7456. But you would not like to be annexed with them?—I would not. If the press were brought in, and the ratepayers made thoroughly conversant with the matter, it is a better managed estate than the city property.

7457. Would it be better if there was a little more money to make it perfectly satisfactory?—I think the money is very well laid out. I have property on the

St. Loman's-road extending to the canal bridge at Ball's-bridge, and were it not for the fact of the tramway crossing there I don't know what the people would do. It is just like an oasis in the midst of a desert, with the people making for it and running to get a good footing.

7458. Supposing you have a body coming forward and suddenly saying, "We have not done as we should have done; we have not the means to do it; we would be able to do much better if we had." Do you take nothing into account for the fact that they have a great deal more money, in proportion, in Pembroke than they have in the city?—I don't know, the taxes are much lighter in the Pembroke township.

7459. You have £6. 3d. in the city against £3. 6d. in the Pembroke township?—It is difficult to manage with so small an amount in the Pembroke township because the nucleus has to come a long distance. In the Rathmines township the nucleus comes from the Green Hills, Templeogue, and it should be much cheaper than in the Pembroke township. There is another matter that I desire to bring before you, and which I consider very important. Now, for example, the Corporation are seeking for a re-valuation of the city property, and I think that would be a great hardship on the citizens.

7460. The Corporation are not seeking for it at all. At present the complaint against them is that they have not sought it?—Well, I am pleased to hear that.

7461. Why should there not be a re-valuation?—I will tell you my views. There are about 25,000 rated holdings within the city of Dublin, and according to the Corporation returns there are 900 of that number tenant dwellings, but I would say that 1,300 would be nearer the total. The tenements are let to one, two, or ten parties, and if there is only one part of the house occupied the owner is liable to the entire rate. Therefore I think that the citizens of Dublin are very hardly pressed, particularly in this class of property.

7462. That is the very complaint that is made that the taxation is uneven because the valuation is not properly adjusted?—It would be difficult to divide the valuation into small parts.

7463. You could value each home according to a regular system or scale?—Yes.

7464. Dr. Norwood.—Where are your houses in the city?—In Brunswick—8, 9, and 10, Upper Brunswick-street.

7465. Where are the other houses?—13, 14, and 15, Kenmare-place, 13, 14, and 15, Harmony-new, and Gandy's Cottages. I have not alone built them, but my father has made the ground.

7466. Are you aware of the extensive work that has been done in the ward in the paving of the South-quay?—What has that to do with the inhabitants? Besides it is not paved, only a portion of it is paved.

7467. Are you aware that the money is ready to pay the balance?—I am not aware of that. We will have to pay our quota of it.

7468. Do you know that the Corporation have made application to the railway company to cause them to stanch these arches?—But they have not been able to get it done. They have the power to compel them to do it, and they have not done it.

7469. Do you know that an application was made for that purpose?—I do not. But I know that the Commissioners said some time ago here that the Corporation had full power to compel the railway company to stanch their arches.

7470. CHAIRMAN.—I never heard a word about it until to-day.

7471. Dr. Norwood.—There is a legal difficulty that has prevented it from being done.

7472. CHAIRMAN.—If the railway company discharge any nuisance on the public street they could be compelled to alter those arches, and they should be.

Witness.—It is the greatest possible nuisance.

7473. Mr. George Keogh (Solicitor to the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway Company).—I must not be taken as acquiescing in any of the observations made by the Corporation.

Mr. FREDERICK STOKES re-examined.

DUNLOP.
July 5, 1873.
Mr. F. Stokes.

7474. Mr. CORROX.—You were originally connected with the formation of the Rathmines township?—Yes; I was one of the promoters of it, and the only promoter now living.

7475. For what reason was Milltown townland left out?—The reason was that a number of the ratepayers—indeed, all the ratepayers then existing—Mr. Herman Hodges, and several others, attended before the Commission which sat here to hear all sides, and they stoutly objected to Milltown being taken in, and we said "If you like we will leave you out," and the result has been that the population has decreased from 859 to 369. And now they want to be taken in, and we offered to take them in if they would go to the expense of getting the necessary order—and that they would not do.

7476. You think they should go with Rathmines now?—We were quite willing enough to take them in, but they would not go to the expense of getting a Local Government Board Order.

7477. With reference to the Terenure boundary drawn by the police board—why was that left out?—I had some correspondence with the late Sir Frederick Shaw on the subject, and though he was rather far from our centre of management, I think the matter could have been arranged to include the townland, as Sir Frederick was favourable to it and wished to bring it in, but some ratepayers opposed the proposition. I think we were quite willing to take in a portion of the townland of Terenure.

7478. And then it fell through for some reason?—Yes, they were opposed to it, and they got up a meeting for the purpose of opposing it. With regard to Milltown they were very sorry they were left out, and wanted to come in, but they would not spend the few pounds necessary to get a Provisional Order. At the same time Milltown would be a loss to us until it was built upon, and although I have no doubt that if taken in it would be built upon, at present it would be a loss to us.

7479. CHAIRMAN.—As we have gone into this matter, I may as well ask you—suppose any portion of these districts was brought in and annexed to the city, what would you say would be done with the representation in the city?—There have been two or three suggestions. One would be to reduce the present number of members of the Corporation to forty-five, giving the remaining fifteen to the townships, who would elect that number, and leaving them as separate wards. Another suggestion would be to reduce the number of the Corporation to forty and to give twenty to the townships. Such an arrangement as that would give, I think it was said, seven to Pembroke, seven to Rathmines, and to form the others—Drumcondra, Glasnevin, and so on—into another ward and give that the remaining six?—If you ask my opinion as a practical man, then it's this: The palpable way to reduce the number would be the best. The fewer the better. It is palpable to me that a

smaller number would do the work better, but then there is a difficulty; if they had to go out by rotation every three years. There should be something divisible by three. That is where there would be a difficulty, but that could be got over, because you could divide them into fifty years.

7480. Would you be for dividing the present wards of the city, or adding on to those wards a portion of the townships—or would you leave the wards the same, and reduce the number of members for the city, and give the townships separate representation if taken into the common family?—The most practicable looking project I have read is that proposed by Mr. Sullivan, M.P. His proposition is that the Corporation should consist of sixty members—forty for the city, eight for Rathmines, eight for Pembroke, and four among the smaller places taken in. Either looks like a tolerably practicable arrangement. It is, however, manifest that the townships should have some number more than what would otherwise be their share, because they are progressive, and the city is not. That appears to be the foundation of a good and reasonable proposition. My opinion is that the Corporation is a great deal too big already, and to make it bigger would be a practical injury to the public.

7481. You have had as much experience in municipal management as most men, from your long connexion with Rathmines. Is it your opinion, then, that if the townships were added to the city sixty working men, doing the best they could, would be able to work the city with the townships?—Oh, dear, yes.

7482. I think there is no Corporation in England or Scotland that has more than sixty-four!—I don't say it with the view of depreciating any body, but there is not a dozen out of the sixty who really give their hands to work it as if it was their own property.

7483. But you think if you had sixty men prepared to give a fair share of their time to the work that the entire of the city and townships could be properly managed?—Yes, or by forty; but the men are difficult to get; I think a better range of people than those my late township, member for member, it would be hard to find, but we found it very difficult to get men of the right stamp. You can get plenty of men who are ornamental sticks with "T.C." after their names, and who do nothing.

7484. But if you get sixty good men?—Yes, men like Philip Bodenham and George Sykes. I name them as illustrations of what a Corporation should be like—it should have men like them. But after such an incorporation you must take into account that the whole outside, a few good men might perhaps be bitterly hostile to themselves then.

7485. Do you think if you were representing Rathmines and there was a good working family here, you would find much opposition?—Perhaps not.

Mr. STEWART BROOKE examined.

Mr. S. Brooke

7486. Dr. MORSEAD.—You are a medical student?—I am.

7487. Do you recollect one Sunday afternoon visiting a lane at the rear of Kenilworth-square?—I remember one Sunday afternoon, about five weeks since, I walked with Mr. Bradley and his son round to see a lane which they asked me to look at. For about 150 yards where you could see up the lane it was in very good order, but going on we turned up the lane, and besides their stable, where the lane could not be seen from the public road, it was in a filthy condition, with rotten cabbage stalks, manure, cinders, &c., and stagnant water in pools that had not been emptied for weeks. The smell from the lane was very powerful. It seemed,

as I have already said, to be very well cleaned as far as you could see it from the public road, but beyond that it was in a filthy condition. There were two or three manure heaps there.

7488. CHAIRMAN (to Mr. MORSEAD).—What does McEvoy say to this?—He acknowledges there was some manure in the lane.

7489. Did he tell you there were these stagnant pools of fetid stuff there?—I didn't ask him that.

7490. Was the fact ever brought before the Town Commissioners of Rathmines that that lane was in the filthy state that has been described?—Not that I am aware of.

7491. Why not—you are the executive sanitary

DONALD
July 2, 1878.
Mr. S. Brooks.

officer, and if you knew that that lane was in that condition you should have inspected it!—As executive sanitary officer it is not my duty to inspect a lane without a sewer in it.

7492. Is it anyone's duty?—The Board might do it.

7493. How can the Board do it except some of its officers report it?—Do you expect the members of the Board to walk through the lanes of the town and each of them to be told off for the purpose—whose duty is it?—The sub-sanitary officer has a right to inspect it.

7494. Did you know the sub-sanitary officer say that he was bound to be in the Town Hall from ten to four o'clock every day?—That is only the assistant sanitary officer. We have two sanitary officers.

7495. You had but one up to last year, and I asked you yesterday whose duty it was, and you said that this sub-sanitary officer was constantly out doing his duty, and yesterday I asked him and he said he was always in the Town Hall from ten to four o'clock. I ask you now whose business, in your opinion, it is to examine lanes in the township, and who should report their condition?—The sub-sanitary officers should inspect the lanes, but it is for the Board to decide whether they will put the sewer in it or not. There never was an application made for one in that lane.

7496. Was it ever brought before the Board that this lane was in a state of nuisance, and that it required a sewer?—Not that I am aware of.

7497. Did you know that it required a sewer?—I did not know, because I never was in it.

7498. You said to-day that it could not be drained because it had not a sewer. Did you ever report to the Board the fact that it had no sewer?—When Mr. Bradley reported that there was fecal matter in it I immediately knew that there was no sewer in it.

7499. But from that day to this, have the Board taken the least action to make a sewer there?—No.

7500. Although they are the sewer authority?—No.

7501. And although there is a nuisance existing there?—No.

7502. Mr. Stokes.—Does Mr. Stokes withdraw his statement that the Board never combined at elections?

7503. Mr. Stokes.—The Board never combined in favour of the outgoing candidates. The only occasion when there was any pretence of the kind was that when the men not going out issued a circular in favour of those men who were going out. To that extent personally they did combine.

[The Chairman here read the evidence that had been given on the point.]

7504. Mr. Stokes.—In point of fact, the members of the Board in their individual capacity always support the outgoing candidate, but as a body they never interfere.

[Mr. Bradley at this stage read a letter dated the 6th of November, 1878, addressed to the ratepayers of the township of Bathmains and Bathgate.]

7505. Mr. Bradley.—That is the letter which accompanied the circular of the outgoing candidates as members of the Board, and in opposition to the gentlemen who were about to contest the ward—Messrs. Bentley, Browns, and Askin. Those were the gentlemen who opposed the outgoing members of the Board. There was direct interference by the Board with the election on behalf of the outgoing members of the Board. The address of the Board's candidates came from the Town Hall. No independent candidate has a chance of election while such things go on.

7506. CHAIRMAN.—This letter is one from Mr. Stokes, saying how interested he is in the township and offering his advice.

7507. Mr. Stokes.—It is manifestly a reply to a libel on the Board itself.

7508. Mr. Evans.—And the outgoing candidates brought the matter of the address of Messrs. Browns,

Askin, and Bentley before the Board, and it was thought that there were strong expensions in it with reference to the Vatry water and the Fire Brigade. The Board never sent out circulars. The candidates made them copy the statement from the advertisement, but the Board never sent out a circular themselves.

7509. CHAIRMAN.—There is nothing in this letter which any Chairman might not write. He is giving his advice, and calling upon the ratepayers to come forward like men, and exercise their own opinions to either turn out the men who had not served them properly, and to put in new men if they thought they would serve them better!—There is not a word more than that.

7510. Yesterday when you were previously under examination you referred us to Mr. Johnson as the person who could give information with regard to the house drainage of the township. And yesterday when Mr. Johnson was examined he said it was no part of his duty, and that he could only speak for 700 houses which he was able to say of his own personal knowledge he have been connected, as he makes the sewer, with which they were connecting them. As to the rest—have the owners of the 2,300 houses in the township been called upon to make connecting drains? Have you, as Town Clerk, and the Board, as far as you know, any record of buildings to give us any information as to how these 2,300 houses are drained?

Mr. Evans.—I can give you a record of every sewer made from 1863 to the present day.

7511. That is not the question!—The record of open sewers is not in my department. I have nothing to say to the open sewers, or to seeing that work done—nothing whatever. What I have to see, after the application is made, is that the money received is accounted for, and then I am done with it.

7512. Do you know that by the law the owner of every house within 100 feet of a public sewer shall be compelled to drain his house into that public sewer?—I could not possibly tell that.

7513. But are you the sanitary authority and you should set to it?—The present Sanitary Act was not the Act at all in 1874.

7514. That is the very thing I deny altogether. Did you ever read the Public Health Act of 1866?—I did; but it was so confused that no one could act on it. As to the matter of opening sewers and all that sort of thing, the late Chairman can tell you what our course has been.

7515. Mr. Stokes.—The modes operated is this: anyone who makes a sewer applies to the secretary to be allowed to make the connection, and lodges the money to pay the expense of the opening, and then permission is given to the Surveyor to open it.

7516. CHAIRMAN.—That is not the law. I will read the Act of Parliament, and Mr. Evans will see if there is any difficulty about it. [Reads the 10th section of the Public Health Act of 1866.] The sewer authority were bound under that Act to go from house to house and see how each was drained. If the houses are within 100 feet of sewer they must stop the draining into a cesspool, and compel the owners of them to drain into a sewer; but if the sewer is beyond 100 feet they may drain into a properly constructed cesspool, not under a house, and if the party noticed does not do the work the sewer authority may make it, and charge the party with it. I ask now was ever such a thing done in Bathmains?

Mr. Evans.—Never. There was no compulsory making of cesspools.

7517. Mr. Stokes.—It is only fair to say in defense of Bathmains that it was not done anywhere else either.

7518. Mr. Johnson (Surveyor of Bathmains Township).—I wish to say that according as the sewers were made and constructed from 1865 they were marked on our map.

Mr. HENRY G. CALDERWOOD examined.

7520. Mr. Killes—You live in the neighbourhood of Clontarf?—Yes, I do.

7521. Do you know Phillipsburgh avenue?—Yes.

7522. Do you know of the existence of a very large ditch up along one side of it?—I do. There are two—one on the east, and the other on the west side of Phillipsburgh avenue.

7523. Is that in the Clontarf township?—It is.

7524. Do you consider that these are dangerous or otherwise, or a source of convenience to the inhabitants of the district?—I consider that they are extremely dangerous.

7525. Did you ever know of any accident occurring in consequence of them?—I happened to be the foreman of a jury, on last Monday, who held an inquest on the body of a man who had been killed there on the preceding Saturday night. His name was Mahony, I think.

7526. Mr. Corcoran.—What was the verdict?—That he met with his death in consequence of having fallen into this ditch, which was one of these I have alluded to.

7527. Mr. Killes—Do you know whether or not he was perfectly sober at the time?—The evidence of several witnesses was that he was perfectly sober.

7528. Did you ever hear of any other accident there?—Yes; about three weeks ago a most respectable lady of the neighbourhood was going home and she fell into one of these ditches—the one on the western side of the road; and I am informed that only she was immediately assisted out, from the position in which she fell into it, she would have lost her life. She had to be taken into a neighbour's house and kept there for a considerable time until she came to. A short time ago there was another case—that of a gentleman going home and the cab was driven into one of those ditches altogether and remained there, I believe, all night, and a lot of people had to dig out the cab and the horse next day. Mr. Alexander, for that was the gentleman's name, was very severely injured; and I may remark that yesterday morning I met a gentleman going into town with me, and he stated that he never came down that road driving that he was not in the greatest misery, afraid that the horse would jump into the ditch, and my own wife is always prepared to jump when passing there being so afraid that she

would be killed. There have been several other instances of accident, and I have been frequently spoken to by the people about these ditches. One widow woman begged of me to do something, because she was in dread her son would be drowned in one of them some time or other, and the man who was killed expressed his fears to several of the inhabitants, amongst the rest to one named Clinton and also to his own grandson, that he would be killed there.

7529. The CHAIRMAN.—Is this evidence to show the bad management of the township of Clontarf?—Yes; to show the dangerous state in which these places are allowed to remain.

7530. Mr. Killes.—Was any application made to the Commissioners to have this ditch filled up?—A person told me that he had written to the Commissioners to get it repaired, and it was propped up with boards, which were subsequently broken and the Commissioners served him with a notice that if he didn't repair them forthwith they would make him responsible.

7531. How is that answer to?—Very badly.

7532. Mr. Norwood.—What about the roadway?—It could not be worse.

7533. CHAIRMAN.—Are you in favour of annexation with Dublin?—Unquestionably; any change would be for the better. As regards the lighting, there are two complaints made about that—one is of the insufficiency of the lighting, and the other is that it is not fairly distributed. About three weeks ago I was at a very lonely part of the township where there were not two houses apparently for a mile, and we came across a lamp at a gate and that was at a Commissioner's house. That is the feeling that exists there with regard to the lighting.

7534. You think it would be beneficial to Clontarf to be annexed to Dublin?—Unquestionably.

7535. As a citizen of Dublin, as I believe you are, do you think it would be better to have them all annexed?—I do.

7536. Do you know anything of the sanitary condition of Clontarf?—I cannot give you any evidence in connection with the subject.

7537. Mr. Norwood.—I now wish to hand in some returns on behalf of the Corporation.

Mr. JAMES BOYLE re-examined.

[Witness handed in a return to the Corporation with reference to the sanitary duties.]

7538. Dr. Norwood.—Is that a return bringing down to the present time the return you furnished to the Select Committee of the House of Commons?—Yes.

7539. With regard to the discharge of the sanitary duties in the city of Dublin?—Yes; it commences on the 1st of January, 1876, and comes down to the 31st of May, 1879. [See appendix No. 16.]

7540. I now wish to get in further returns. This is a return [handed in] in which the information is brought down to the end of 1878, commencing in one of the

DUBLIN.
July 2, 1879.Mr. Henry G.
Calderwood.

returns—[see Appendix No. 24]—I should say there are two returns, one from 1866 to 1878, and the other from 1874 to 1878, inclusive.

7541. What may we call them?—No. 1 is the amount of local income derived from the city as distinguished from the suburban portion of the metropolitan district for the five years—from 1874 to 1878. No. 2 is a return of the number of police employed in the city and in the suburbs. The former gives all the sources of income from taxation, pawnbrokers' licences, and ground rents.

Mr. BEVERIDGE, Town Clerk, re-examined.

Mr. Beveridge.

7542. Dr. Norwood.—You wish to make an addition to your former testimony?—Yes, with regard to the allegation of Mr. McEvoy about the slack attendance of members at the meetings of the Town Council. I have prepared a return in continuation of that in the appendix to the Parliamentary report of the Committee on the Local Government and Irrigation of Towns in Ireland, No. 332, of 1876. [See appendix No. 25.] It brings it down for three years, and it shows this. In 1878 there were thirty-six meetings summoned for one

o'clock, and the standing order requires that the Town Clerk shall call the roll at a quarter past one, and on calling the roll we had losses present on thirty-three of those occasions at that hour, on two occasions at twenty minutes past one, and on the remaining occasion at twenty-five minutes past one. With regard to the question of political meetings there was no meeting which bore anything like a political complexion in 1876.

7543. When you say politics do you mean religious

DUNDEE,
July 5, 1879.
Mr. BEVERIDGE.

or political i—Political or patriotic. There was no such meeting. In 1877 there was one meeting of that kind—to adopt a petition to Parliament in regard to University Education in Ireland, and one with regard to the Clerical Abuses Bill. Those were the only meetings of that kind in that year.

7544. Were those special meetings for those purposes?—They were special meetings so as not to interfere with the ordinary business of the Council. In 1878 there was a meeting to petition the Government in favor of the release of the political prisoners, one to present a vote of congratulation on the accession of Pope Leo XIII., and one to petition Parliament with regard to the Irish University Bill—so that there were three in 1878. There were therefore five in three years of anything of a political nature.

7545. And these were on separate field days?—Yes. These are the three years, and a continuation of the return for three years (1873, 1874, and 1875), which appears in the Report of the Select Committee on Local Government and Taxation of Towns (No. 362 of 1876). I was elected Town Clerk on the 9th of September last. Since then there have been fifty-nine meetings of the Municipal Council, and on only two occasions did we adjourn for want of quorum. One of those was a case in which, for fear the whole of the business would not be disposed of, a member had moved that the Council at its rising should adjourn until next day. The business was, however, disposed of, but Councillor French opposed an standing orders motion to rescind the resolution as to adjournment, and next day insisted on my coming up and calling the roll, and only four members were present. On the other occasion there were seventeen members present. If the Commissioners make any recommendation with reference to the reduction of the quorum, they may remember that that last-named was a case in which the high quorum prevented the holding of a meeting.

7546. You were Secretary to Committee No. 11—Yes, for three and a half years.

7547. Did you ever know at a meeting of that Committee any political discussion?—Nothing of the kind.

7548. They met principally i—Yes, we never wanted a quorum for three years, except once, and then it was because there was a meeting of the House going on at the time. In the year ending the 31st of October last, there were 144 meetings of the Paving, Lighting, and Cleaning Committee, sixty-one meetings of the Markets Committee, seventy of the Finance and Loans Committee; fifty-seven of the Waterworks Committee, and forty-seven of the General Purposes Committee, besides the usual weekly meetings of the Public Health Committee on Thursdays. There was a statement made, that in no case in England where there was a local body already formed outside the borough, had an extension been granted in opposition to the wishes of the people.

Mr. John
Bentley

7549. CHAIRMAN.—I came here about Mr. Bentley's evidence given in May last; he said that the landlords of Bathmains paid nearly all the rates, and that they withheld them until after the 31st August, so as to disqualify their tenants. I have 1,586 ratings to collect; the township rate is struck on the 1st January, and I hold in my hand for the current year, only six months of which have gone by, ten block receipts of 100 each, that is 1,000 up to the present paid off this year's rates, and I have not more than forty landlords' receipts, and if the landlords paid them I would not have more than 100 receipts paid up to the present moment. There are 1,000 receipts; Mr. Bentley may examine them if he likes, and I think they will disprove his statement altogether, and I think it is most unfair to the landlords of Bathmains that it should be made.

In eight of these ten cases there was a previous local organization either under the Highway Acts, the Local Government Act, or the Sanitary Acts, or the Public Health Acts.

7549. Have you given the names of those cases?—Yes, I have. One was the case of Nottingham.

7550. I wish you now to give in a return of the valuation i—Yes; I have got from the Collector-General the return of the valuation, and it is £630,950 for Improvement Rate purposes up to the 30th of June, 1878. [Appendix No. 4.]

7551. Mr. Monahan.—There have been certain returns put in with reference to the attendance of members of the Corporation. I am instructed to tell you that we have a return as to the proceedings of the Corporation and the attendance, and to ask you to examine witness to give that evidence. This matter about the attendance of the Corporation was mentioned for the first time at the close of their case.

7552. Dr. Jervisoff.—Not at all.

7553. CHAIRMAN.—I fear, Mr. Monahan, you cannot go into evidence now.

Mr. BEVERIDGE examined.

7554. Mr. Killen.—Is it not a fact that the city own a large portion of Clontarf?—Yes; but it is let on a very long lease to the Earl of Charlemont.

7555. Is there any reason why Clontarf should not be annexed with the other townships to the city?—I know only of the objections urged by the witness who have already spoken—that it does not lie along the city boundary, but simply touches the city at the bridge, and that the inhabited portion of Clontarf is separated from the city by a tract of land which is not built on. With reference to the land that Lord Charlemont has a lease of, I have no doubt that when that lease falls in that land will be built on.

7556. Is not Fairview a part of Clontarf, and there are a large number of houses there?—It is separated from the city boundary as I have said before.

7557. Mr. O'Donnell.—I wish to hand in a return showing the total receipts and the total payments during the six years ended the 31st of August 1877. [See Appendix No. 26.] It is a summary of the abstracts of the Local Government Board Auditor. I hand this return in with the view of showing that Mr. Vernon was incorrect when he stated that the Corporation exceeded their income by £30,000 a year. The City Debentures are now at par—since the statement was made by Mr. Vernon—within the last ten days or so.

7558. Mr. Storer.—I happen to be a holder of City Debentures and they are not anything like at par.

7559. Mr. O'Donnell.—These Debentures are for £100 Irish, equal to £2 6s. 2d. English, and I have seen them quoted within 2s. 6d. of the latter amount.

Mr. JOHN SAUNDERS, Estate-collector, Bathmains, examined.

7561. What is the number of houses of which the landlords pay the taxes in Bathmains?—Out of 1,886 ratings there are something about 500; I hold in my hand my block of last year's collection which amounted to £5,000. The rate was struck on the 1st January, and the 31st August was the last day for payment to qualify to vote, and out of that £5,000, on the 1st September last, I had only £317 to get in.

7562. Suppose there were a 3s. 6d. rate in Bathmains, could you collect it as well?—Not for some time.

7563. To the extent of my 500 holdings out of the 1,886, don't you think that the landlords have a most direct interest in keeping the taxation as low as possible, in other words, in starving the township to benefit the owners themselves?—That might be.

7564. But I want your opinion; have they not a

most direct interest against the 1,300 other rate-payers in keeping the taxation as low as possible, totally regardless, it may be, of the wants of the township!—I hardly think that is so.

7565. Do you know any reason why Rathmines should only have to pay £x. in the pound, while Pembroke pays 3s. 3d.—I think there is only 1d. difference.

7566. Is there any reason that you know why Rathmines can be kept in proper condition for the 1d. less than Pembroke; is Pembroke better managed and paying more than it ought to pay, or is Rathmines paying less than it should pay?—Unfortunately, in Rathmines everyone owns ground, and you may build a hut there if you please, but it is not so in Pembroke, for the Earl of Pembroke holds nearly the whole of the ground, and there must be plan sent into the estate office of any building proposed, and he will not give an inch of ground unless on the undertaking that £1,000 is to be spent.

7567. Would not Rathmines be likely to want more rates than Pembroke, because if you allow those smaller classes of habitations the cost of providing for them would be much more than providing for the better class houses!—Yes.

7568. Mr. Mangan.—Is it a fact that the road materials have to be brought a much greater distance into Pembroke than in Rathmines!—No doubt of it.

7569. The materials for Rathmines roads are on the spot!—As a rule.

7570. In fact, the metalling of the road is found quite close in Rathmines, but in Pembroke it has to be brought a great distance!—It has.

7571. And that would be calculated to make the rate higher in Pembroke!—Yes.

7572. Do you know is it the case that the roads and pathways are wider and longer, and on a handsomer scale in the Pembroke township than in Rathmines?—Certainly.

7573. And is it not the case that if a road is much larger and wider, with a wider pathway and wider carriage-way, the maintenance will be much heavier than when the road is comparatively narrow!—Most unquestionably.

7574. Might not that tend to account for the expense of Pembroke being greater than Rathmines!—Certainly.

Mr. CURRIE, City Treasurer, recalled.

Mr. Carter.

7590. Dr. Norwood.—Is this a summary of the rental from 1843 to 1859, and from 1859 to the 31st August, 1878!—Yes. (See Appendix No. 27.)

7591. What do the figures show!—They show that since the present Corporation came into office in 1843 a total of rents accrued upon the rental of the estate of £923,025, and that the total amount received was £907,421.

7592. That includes the Baldrylic rents!—It does. During that period since 1843, here is an abstract made out by the City Accountant, showing the total abatement was £5,400, of which £3,087 was an accumulation of arrears, three-fourths of which the present Corporation inherited from the old Corporation; in fact, there was £1,500 of arrears handed down by the old Corporation, and in 1844 there were £830 of

old arrears struck off by Act of Parliament; the remainder is accounted for in this way: there were some bad arrears of collection and some allowances for repairs and improvements. The loss per cent. has been under 1% ad. in every £100. Having regard to the enormous collection, and there being only £5,500 lost altogether in the way I have stated, it is strange there should be such a statement made as was made by Mr. Vernon—that the estate was an estate on paper. (See Appendix No. 10.)

7593. Dr. Norwood.—I take the liberty of handing in this statement, and also a statement of the public debt, and the result that could be effected by a sale of the estate in the great saving of interest on loans for the debt could then be reduced. (Appendix No. 28.)

Mr. PETER SHERIDAN, examined.

Mr. Peter Sheridan.

7594. Dr. Norwood.—As a citizen of Dublin, do you think it would be desirable to annex the townships to Dublin!—Certainly, and I can give my reasons. I have taken from "Thom's Directory" a list of decayed streets in the city, and which were at one time tax-paying streets, and I find they amount to 253.

7595. Why should the townships be annexed to the city on account of the decay of these streets!—There

has been an exodus from a large number of streets in the city, and people have gone away into the townships, and they should, in fairness, pay something to the city which they used largely.

7596. Are you able to say, from the inquiries you have made, that there have been a large number of evictions in towns in England!—Yes; I have a letter from the proprietor of the Bradford Mail, and I

DUBLIN.
July 3, 1878.
Mr. John
Sheridan.

BERLIN,
July 2, 1912
Mr. Price
Sheridan.

am able to say that a large number of large towns have annexations made to them, and I believe also that, as amalgamation has effected a saving there, it would effect a saving here also; because, in point of fact, instead of having six municipalities, which are very expensive in their way, it all could be done by one central body. In reference to representation, I would decidedly agree to lop off one councillor from each of the city wards, and give that representation to the townships, and I think you would have an improved representation from the townships.

7607. Did you think that infusing new blood into the Corporation would do good?—No, but the ambitions of the townships appear to be of a very selfish character. The townships have large public companies, and I have seen some loads of coal and things of that kind go from the town into the townships. As to the state of the county roads, I was very much pleased to hear that the Grand Jury was inclined to come in.

7608. Do you consider that there should be a general revolution?—Yes, certainly, and I can give instances showing the necessity for it—a house in Johnston's court, for instance; it was formerly occupied by a nobleman; it now produces over £50 a year, and the valuation is £10. I could give other instances.

7609. Mr. Bentley.—I understand Mr. Sanderson to say that I had made a statement that was incorrect with regard to the landlords in Rathmines. You have had in evidence that there are about 3,700 houses in Rathmines, and, generally speaking, in nine cases out of every ten, it is the custom of the landlord to contract with the tenant to pay the taxes. You will find in one of the legal cases that unless the two minimums of the Tax Improvement rate and Borough rate are paid before the 31st August the tenant is dispossessed. You have then Mr. Sanderson's statement that there are about 1,000 burgesses on the roll of rates, and I say how comes it that we have only 1,000 on the roll. I say the landlords have neglected to pay two millions, and the tenants are dispossessed at that way.

7610. CHAIRMAN.—The tenants have that power in their own hands—they can go and pay for the landlord if they like, and deduct it from the rent?—They often do it.

7601. Mr. Stokes.—You said there were 3,700 ratings for houses, and that there were only 300 unpaid on the 31st August.

7602. Mr. Somers.—There are 700 ladies included in that, and about 300 people leave Rathmines in every twelve months.

7603. Mr. Bentley.—That may account for it. As there are some of the gentlemen of the Board of Rathmines now present, perhaps they would afford some information as to the water supply of the townships.

7604. CHAIRMAN.—It is turned on now.

7605. Mr. Bentley.—But it is deficient, and they are about to promote a new scheme.

7606. CHAIRMAN.—We have nothing to do with that.

7607. Mr. Bentley.—But the water question is greatly bound up with the question of annexation, for there are a large number in Rathmines who would not be for annexation if we had Vartry water. We have had two large public meetings in favour of the Vartry water in the township.

7608. Colonel Richard Herford.—I am one of Mr. Bentley's tenants.

7609. Mr. Bentley.—Do you know a laneway spoken of behind your house?—I do.

7610. What state is it in at present?—I have not seen it for the last fortnight, but a short time ago it was in a beastly state, I could not describe it by any other name.

7611. Was it scavenged?—I would say it was never scavenged.

7612. Is it a nuisance?—Certainly; it is so offensive as to be a nuisance.

7613. How are you off with the water?—Since this investigation began we are very well off, but before that the water was turned off during the late frost as well as at night time.

7614. But since this investigation it has been turned on constantly?—Yes.

7615. How long have you been living there?—About two years.

7616. What is your opinion during that time as to the state of the roads—are they properly scavenged?—No; they have not been properly scavenged in my idea.

7617. Have you seen road stuff allowed to accumulate?—Yes.

7618. And then taken off for the purpose of top-dressing?—Yes.

7619. Did the offensive state of that has continued up to a fortnight ago, when you saw it last?—No; about a month ago.

7620. It was cleaned then?—No, I have not seen it since, but it was in that condition about a month ago.

7621. Mr. Monahan, q.d.—When you speak of what way the roads should be done have you any particular place in your mind to compare it with?—Certainly—Bath.

7622. Then your evidence is, that the roads are not kept as well as in Bath?—I go further, and I say I have seen places infinitely superior.

7623. Infinitely is a very large word?—Well, very much superior.

7624. In England?—Yes.

7625. You did not consider anything about the comparative nature of the sub-soil, and that the difference in the condition of the roads might depend on the nature of the sub-soil?—I did not conceive that the subsoil had anything to do with the refuse lying on the side of the road. It is not the nature of the roads I speak of, but the scavenging of them.

7626. Your evidence does not apply to the state of repair of the roads?—No.

7627. You consider that unsatisfactory?—They appear to be tolerably satisfactory.

7628. CHAIRMAN.—What I understand him to speak of is this lane, which he says is in a beastly condition, and it was represented to us that Mr. Bentley was totally mistaken about it, and the contradiction of Mr. Bentley's statement was made by Mr. Evans on the authority of Mr. McEvoy, the sanitary officer.

7629. Dr. Norwood.—You have seen a good many towns and cities. Do you agree with the gentleman, a Commissioner of Rathmines, who says that the condition of Rathmines and its roads is only inferior to Paris?—I don't agree with him. I have been to Paris.

7630. You think Paris is superior?—Except you go to some of the slums of Paris.

7631. Have you considered the question of annexation?—I have.

7632. What do you think of it?—I should vote for annexation if it was only for want of fire brigades. My house has been on fire, and on each side of me there was no water, and I have had the pleasant prospect of being burnt out.

7633. And was it during the time the water was turned off from nine to six in the morning?—Yes, and on another occasion a child was taken ill, the doctor ordered it a bath, and there was no water except what had been kept over from the night before, and there are other reasons against the system.

7634. There were no means provided of having a bath for the child?—Except that the necessity had been foreseen, and had been provided for.

The inquiry then closed.

RATHMINES.—3RD SEPTEMBER, 1879

Before Mr. W. A. EXHAM, Q.C.

Mr. JOHN H. EVANS, examined.

RATHMINES,
Sept. 3, 1879.
Mr. John H.
Evans.

Mr. Samuel Walker, Q.C. instructed by Mr. Thomas Fitzgerald, appeared on behalf of the Rathmines Town Commissioners.

Dr. Norwood, instructed by Mr. Bentley, appeared on behalf of ratepayers in the township.

Mr. McShane, law agent, and Mr. Beresford, town clerk, attended on behalf of the Corporation.

1. Mr. Fitzgerald.—In pursuance of our advertisement none of the inhabitants of Milltown and Terenure have come here to give evidence on the question of annexation; of course it is for them to speak and not for us; the Rathmines Township Commissioners take no part in the matter for the present. If the people in those outlying districts wish to come in and be annexed, then the Rathmines Commissioners will give them every assistance in their power.

2. Mr. John H. Evans, Secretary to the Rathmines Town Commissioners, said the area of the township was about 1,470 acres, the valuation £97,383, and the population about 23,000.

3. CHAIRMAN.—Can you tell me how much of that £97,000 is land and how much buildings?—I could not, we don't separate them.

4. They would be separated in the Valuation Book?—No, we don't require that.

5. Do they all pay the same?—They are of uniform rating. No exceptions.

6. Does the Railway Company pay full rate?—Yes.

7. You are divided into two wards?—Yes, Rathmines and Rathgar.

8. And the whole are in the electoral division of Rathmines?—Yes, with the exception of the townland of Ballymount, which is in the electoral division of Donnybrook, with a very small valuation of about £1,000.

9. What have been your rates since 1874?—In 1874 municipal rate 2s, poor law rate 1s. 4d.; 1875 2s. and 1s.; 1876 2s. and 1s. 9d.; 1877 2s. 4d. and 1s. 2d.; 1878 2s. 4d. and 1s. 4d.

10. Of course the county at large charges are included in the municipal rate?—Yes.

11. As I understand it, as far as the Town Commissioners are concerned, they are satisfied with their present boundary?—That was the opinion of the Board.

12. About the wards are they satisfied also?—Quite satisfied.

13. How many Commissioners are there returned for each ward?—Fifteen for Rathmines proper, and three for Rathgar.

14. What is the relative valuation of the two?—Rathmines is the larger of the two—Rathgar is at present about sixteen thousand.

15. Rathgar then returns three Commissioners, and Rathmines in one ward fifteen?—It was an arrangement with the Rathgar people, who wished to join us; they have only three Commissioners. It would have increased the Board largely to have had more, and they were quite satisfied with three.

16. Does the Board believe any useful purpose would be achieved by dividing Rathmines into wards?—They do not.

17. Are the wards the same for Poor Law purposes?—No, there is only one—it is the electoral division for Poor Law purposes.

18. Am I to understand that, as far as the Town Commissioners are concerned, they are in this position, they want to be left alone, and don't want to get any portion of Milltown or Terenure?—They have no special wish to get them. But the circumstances are altered as to Milltown, since the answer was sent in, in consequence of the main drainage of Milltown passing through Rathmines.

19. Your boundaries are marked in green on the map (produced)?—Yes, the electoral division is

co-extensive with the township, with the exception of Milltown, which is not in the township, and which is a little bit in Donnybrook.

20. It is the recommendation of the Parliamentary Committee that a Township should be as nearly as possible in one electoral division, and it would appear to be a matter of course to bring in, at all events, that part of Milltown which is in the electoral division of Rathmines, and thus bring in that portion of the electoral division not already in the township?—It is the natural limit, and would have been joined in 1847 but for a few ratepayers who wished to be exempt.

21. All outside in the Donnybrook district is in Pembroke Township?—Yes.

22. And at present Rosdowden is just left out from both?—Just between two stools.

23. It would be more natural to join Milltown to you than Pembroke, for it would be splitting an electoral division to join it to Pembroke?—Yes.

24. What about Terenure?—It is far more difficult as to that, for it is in another electoral division, and in another barony, and it is only portion of the townland of Terenure, which is an immense townland including Bushy Park, and going off a long way, perhaps thirteen or fourteen hundred acres, as large almost as the district of Rathmines. I could not give you much information about it because we could not get a valuation of it.

25. Dr. Norwood.—What portion of Terenure is comprised within the water district, formed by the Board of Guardians as the sanitary authority?—That is a very small area—the little village of Terenure.

26. Do you know its boundaries?—I do not.

27. Could you ascertain it?—I don't think I could.

28. Of course the Board of Guardians must know the exact boundary for the purpose of the chargeability?—It is chargeable to the whole electoral division of Rathmines.

29. CHAIRMAN.—I see that Rathmines Little and Rathmines Great are two townlands outside the district, and they are very thinly inhabited. Have you received any application from the people of Terenure that they wished to be joined?—The opponents to that bill, when they appeared in the House of Commons, expressed a wish to be joined to Rathmines, but further than that I know nothing.

30. You have heard nothing further since?—No. There was no application, in fact, they were cautious in making an application, for it would have ousted their hill altogether.

31. The Metropolitan Police District covers the whole of the district of Terenure?—Yes.

32. Does it cover the entire of the electoral division of Rathgarham?—No; it goes off over so far—it covers all the Milltown district.

33. Would there be any objection to making the Metropolitan district your boundary?—This is all agricultural rating.

34. Supposing it was taken in as a differential scale of rating, you not being bound to water at light the district, and only making them pay a certain amount of the rate until you give them light and water—what would you say to that?—That is a large question for me to answer; but I don't think my Board would undertake the management of the district, considerably larger than their own, and I don't think the inhabitants of the district themselves would submit to it.

35. There appears to be a great number of terraces and rows of houses in the district?—That is in Terenure; and if an application is made our Board would be prepared to consider it.

36. In point of fact, is this land likely to be built

RATHMINES,
Sept. 8, 1897.
Mr. John H.
Evans.

upon if your township is extended!—There is not much land.

37. Is it being built upon!—Well, it is being built upon year after year—villa residences. It is in another electoral division.

38. Dr. Norwood.—In that portion supplied with water of which I was speaking a little while ago!—No; only a little bit of it. The Rathmines Commissioners supplied water to fifteen houses in that district outside our district, and we have continual applications for water from new houses. In fact, as soon as houses are built they apply for water.

39. CHAIRMAN.—Does Terenure-terrace come within the part you mentioned!—Yes.

40. And is Rathfarnham outside!—Yes; it is in the next constabulary district in the county.

41. Suppose they were brought in, paying the same road-rate and the same county-at-large charges, and that the Rathmines Commissioners were not bound to give them water or light until they found it expedient to do so, would you say it would be still objectionable to put it under your management!—I do not say it is objectionable, but I don't think the Board would be prepared to take the management of it. It is a district as large again as Rathmines, and they would be dealing with discontented people and others, and there would only be a small valuation along the roads.

42. But you should be well able to keep the roads

as cheap as the county contractors!—It would be undertaking a large management, and the principle of the Rathmines Commissioners is to give their whole attention to the district under them.

43. We have to consider something beyond merely the wishes of the Rathmines Commissioners. When was the district comprised in the Terenure Bill!—They took in all marked yellow, and they went up Rathfarnham and took in Ballypark—Mr. Blackhurst's demesne—and the owners of villas, thinking it would be an advantage, joined them at once.

44. What is the county-rate they pay out there!—About £2. 3d. in the £.

45. If you get £2. 3d. you would be able to do the roads!—It is only a matter of undertaking—it is not suitable for building at all—in fact, the Corporation never thought of bringing it in.

46. Do you think it would be better to bring in the whole Metropolitan district under one Board!—That police district may be changed at any moment.

47. Mr. Walker.—The proper thing would be to change that—it is an arbitrary one.

48. Dr. Norwood.—We have investigated the history of the Metropolitan district, and I cannot find out any reason why it is framed that way. Many of the traces of the boundaries have been lost.

49. Mr. Walker.—A little agitation would bring in Glenariff, and make it part of the Metropolitan district.

Examination of Mr. Evans, resumed.

50. Dr. Norwood.—What was the district the Board of Guardians were wanting to get a supply of water for in Rathfarnham!—It goes up to the convent. We have a public fountain outside our district, in the Terenure district.

51. Are these negotiations still in progress!—I don't know what state they are in at present. The

Corporation have stopped the extension of that pipe, and the Board of Guardians are now applying to us for a supply, and shutting up the Corporation fountain.

52. Does the part they were applying for include Mr. Blackhurst's demesne!—It does.

Mr. ALEXANDER PARKER, J.P., TOWN Commissioner, examined, said:

53. There is nothing like an individual illustration. My firm are rated in Dublin at £400 a year. We pay our rates, I need not say, faithfully and regularly. I am rated in Rathmines at £55. My interest, so to speak, is much greater in the city than in the township, therefore I may be regarded as impartial, at all events. But in your view of a rate in aid, I should be called upon to pay my rate as a citizen, my rate as an inhabitant of the township, and a rate in aid besides. That appears to be a great hardship, especially as in the township I am protected from interference by an Act of Parliament passed specially for the creation of the township, the conferring upon

it of certain privileges, and protected from encroachments and interference. Indeed, we want to be left alone. We don't want to interfere with anybody, and we don't want anybody to interfere with us. If mal-administration can be brought home to us, there might be good reason for interfering with us. Mal-administration has never been charged. The latest delivery of the auditor of our account gives us a complete clearance from all error and mismanagement in the money matters of the township. Indeed, under these circumstances, we would object to your proposing any rate in aid, on the ground I have stated, that it would tax me three times over.

Mr. T. C. Lecombe, examined.

54. You are a resident in Rathmines!—Yes.

55. Is it your view that Milltown should be incorporated in Rathmines!—Certainly; and Mr. G. Burke requested me to come here and suggest it.

56. Would you suggest that the whole of the district should be taken in up as far as the Penrhos district!—No, only the portion not in either township and within the Metropolitan district.

57. Is that the feeling of members of the inhabitants there!—Well, we are not very many about there, but it is the feeling of the majority there.

58. Is the district at present lighted!—No, and the sanitary condition is not to be envied.

59. That is opening up a matter we had better not touch on here!—I believe our sanitary condition would be improved.

60. What is your county rate!—2s. 3d. I think 2s. 4d. county rate, and 3d. sanitary rate: we pay sanitary rate and get nothing for it.

61. In point of fact you would save money by being brought in here!—I think so. I pay water rate also but that is for my own convenience; we want to improve our sanitary condition, which is dreadful; we want sewerage and sanitary officers.

62. Suppose the rates put on you were 3s. 6d. or 4s. would you object to that if brought in!—I think not.

MR. SAMUEL BEWLEY, examined, said :

63. I am not quite in the same position as Mr. Lesscombe, for I don't agree with him about drainage; my drainage is perfect, but I am very anxious that we should come into the Rathmines district, more for the sake of my neighbours than myself, and for the sake of the whole district.

64. Would you be equally anxious to go with Rathmines to the Corporation?—No, most unquestionably so. I have the fullest confidence in the Rathmines Commissioners, but not the less in the Corporation of Dublin.

65. Mr. Lesscombe.—We would certainly not wish to be joined to the Corporation of Dublin, I would much prefer being annexed to Rathmines.

66. Is that because you have confidence in the Rathmines Commissioners and not in the Corporation?—I would not say the latter. I have confidence in the Commissioners, and I prefer to be annexed to Rathmines.

67. Mr. Besley.—I object to any country district being burdened with enormous superannuation allowances and other things which the Corporation of Dublin have very largely involved themselves in.

68. But suppose you had to pay the same rates whether you were annexed to the Corporation of Dublin or the Commissioners here, what would be your view?—I don't care—it does not affect me personally in the least.

69. Supposing you were joined to the city of Dublin, and had the benefit of its fire brigade, and further water, and that the rates were the same, and that only the hand to receive them was changed, could you have any objection then to come under the Dublin Corporation?—Not the slightest, but I do not see much chance as to the changes.

70. You want to be annexed to somebody and so to be put under some governing body?—My object is to be in communication with the township. We know the work is so truly well done. I am partly in the township.

71. Is the water ever turned off from you during the day?—I never heard of it being turned off.

72. Dr. Norwood.—Do you remember an application for water for a district?—I do.

73. From whom did you get it?—From the Commissioners at once. I have no domestic supply; it is only for a farm here.

74. Where do you get your domestic supply from?—From pumps. I am too high for the Rathmines supply.

75. They could not supply you?—They could, I believe, but there is not so much pressure, but they will have the pressure when the other supply comes down from the mountain.

76. Mr. Luceovic.—We have no water supply for the poor people in Roundtown at present.

77. CHAIRMAN.—The Corporation could give you plenty, that is certain.

78. Mr. Besley.—And charge you well for it too.

79. Mr. Walker.—Are there any gentlemen here from Terenure?

80. Mr. Evans.—Mr. Townsend called yesterday and said he was engaged and could not come out.

81. CHAIRMAN.—How much of the Terenure district did the Corporation propose to include?

82. Mr. Bewridge.—We handed in a return of that.

83. CHAIRMAN.—Paying that 2s. Id. besides water rates, do you, Mr. Lesscombe, find your roads are kept better or in the same way as the Rathmines roads?—No, our roads are kept very bad indeed.

84. Even paying that?—Yes, and we have remonstrated several times.

85. With the Grand Jury!—Well, yes; I had once to send a petition to them, and I know they have sent

in from the neighbourhood to the Finance Committee to stop payment to the contractor.

86. You are paying more for your roads than in Rathmines?—Yes, and I would save the rent for water, and I would have to pay less for gas if I was in the township.

87. MR. EVANS.—The county-at-large charge is a poundage and the same everywhere throughout the whole country.

88. CHAIRMAN.—We would like to know the view of the Commissioners as to the suggestion if we came to the conclusion that something ought to be done to aid Dublin, treating it as the Metropolis. Do you think it would be better to leave the townships as they are, and that they should contribute something towards the city or would you propose a Metropolitan Board?

89. MR. SAMUEL H. FALES.—I would prefer a Metropolitan Board and something on the same basis as in London, but the question then would be who would form that Board?—It should be an independent Board entirely. It could not take place with the Corporation at all.

90. MR. PARKER.—A rate in aid put into the town funds of the Corporation would just be applied to general corporate purposes?

91. CHAIRMAN.—Is it the view of your clients, Dr. Norwood, that the Terenure portion should not be annexed to Rathmines?

92. MR. PARKER.—For whom does Dr. Norwood appear?—For a number of rate payers, who complained that there has been, not exactly mis-administration, but non-administration.

93. CHAIRMAN.—What is your opinion as to extending Rathmines by bringing in Terenure and Milltown?

94. MR. BESLEY.—I object to any explanation if we are to remain an independent township, but if we are to be annexed to the city it is really a different thing.

95. CHAIRMAN.—As to Milltown it is almost as important of course, for that squares up the electoral division.

96. MR. MICHAEL MURPHY, Town Commissioner of Rathmines.—It is the wish of the Commissioners to entertain any proposal from any outlying district.

97. MR. BESLEY.—There was an application by Milltown to be brought in.

98. MR. PARKER.—Originally it was proposed to include Milltown but they made a strong stand against it, and then their application to be brought in years afterwards was refused. All our improvements had been made and they had escaped the expense and then they wanted to join us; that is the history of the exclusion.

99. MR. BESLEY.—It was one man who opposed it; he is now gone and we did not experience the admirals working of the Rathmines Commissioners at the time.

100. MR. EVANS.—Most of the opponents expressed their desire to join Rathmines rather than have a new township formed.

101. CHAIRMAN.—You appear to be satisfied to remain as you are so far as the Rathmines Commissioners are concerned.

102. MR. FALES.—There are circumstances about Terenure which make it exceptional: we supply them indeed with water and they pay for it. The only question is whether they would rather be attached to Fonthill or Rathmines.

103. MR. BESLEY.—Certainly to Rathmines.

104. MR. PARKER.—Speaking for myself I would say nothing rather than annexation to the Dublin Corporation.

The inquiry then terminated.

RATHMINES
Sept 1, 1881
Mr. Samuel
Bewley.

PEMBROKE—NOVEMBER 8TH, 1879.

Before Messrs. COTTON, C.E., and ROBINSON.

Mr. Thomas Fitzgerald, Solicitor, attended on behalf of the Pembroke Township Commissioners.

Mr. ARTHUR H. ROBINSON, Secretary to the Pembroke Township Commissioners, examined.

1. Mr. CORROK.—The queries sent by us were submitted to the Commissioners?—Yes.

2. They were considered by them, and you were instructed to answer them in the way in which you have done?—Yes. There is one query, No. 4, which I should explain as regards the townlands outside our township, and in the Donnybrook electoral division. The question is: “Are the municipal and poor law boundaries at present determined?” No, and the answer is, “No; the townlands of Annfield, Sallymount, Priesthouse, Simmonscourt, and Clonakeagh are outside the township, but in the Donnybrook electoral division.” Now, that answer might mislead you on looking at the map, for there is a small portion of the townland of Clonakeagh in the barony of Upper Cross outside the township, namely: one reed, sixteen perches.

3. The Commissioners consider that no alteration in the boundaries is required?—None; they are perfectly satisfied with their existing boundaries.

4. Quite independent of the question of annexation to Dublin?—Yes.

5. Have they ever considered the question of making the township continuous with the electoral division?—That question was never before the Board.

6. Were they aware there was a recommendation of the select committee on the subject?—I have not heard it mentioned.

7. Do you know the townland of Priesthouse?—Yes.

8. Was the question ever considered of including the townlands of Simmonscourt and Priesthouse so as to complete the electoral division?—Never.

9. Seeing that there is a recommendation of the Parliamentary Committee, and seeing that these two townlands would complete the electoral division, we would like to have some reason why you do not propose to include them?—The question has not been considered, and I would not like to give any answer upon it.

10. Are you aware whether there is any feeling amongst the ratepayers differing from that of the Commissioners on this question?—No; I may say the ratepayers as a body are with the Commissioners, and quite against annexation.

11. On looking at the map there appears to be a townland of Milltown which is left out altogether; have you ever considered the question of taking it in?—It is new to be taken in by Rathfarnham.

12. Mr. Fitzgerald.—At the inquiry in Rathfarnham the Milltown people came forward and expressed a wish to be taken into Rathfarnham.

13. Mr. CORROK.—We should like to have any reasons that occur to any Commissioner why the municipal boundary should not be made continuous with the electoral division by taking in these two townlands.

14. Mr. John E. Vernon, M.A., Chairman Pembroke Commissioners—I do not think, as far as we are concerned, we would make any objection to taking them in, but the people in Priesthouse and Simmonscourt might object. I should perhaps state how our boundary was originally made. It is an arbitrary looking boundary on the map, but as a matter of fact, what we went for our Act of Parliament we found ourselves in this difficulty—we had to deal with the Grand Jury of the county, and they were very unwilling to have any division made in a barony or baronies, and therefore we adopted the whole barony of Dublin, but the Blackrock township took a small portion of that barony from us. I allude to that very peculiar looking tongue that runs out as you see on the map. Short

of that we took the barony of Dublin, and by that means we met the Grand Jury and they raised no objection whatever to our Act of Parliament; besides it avoided great complications of accounts, and that was the only ground on which we took that particular boundary.

15. Have you any reason for thinking the Grand Jury would object now to include Priesthouse and Simmonscourt in the township?

Mr. Vernon.—I do not know. I have not consulted them, but I should be inclined to think they would not.

16. Mr. ROBINSON.—Do you know the district?

Mr. Vernon.—Perfectly.

17. Mr. ROBINSON.—Is it much built upon?

Mr. Vernon.—It is a good deal built upon. The top of Aylesbury-road runs into the township. I do not think, as far as I know the feeling of the township, they would like to be aggressive towards these townlands, but they would not object to take them in.

18. Mr. ROBINSON.—For the purpose of rectifying the boundary?

Mr. Vernon.—Yes; if so desired. We were extremely anxious not to interfere with our neighbours, and were as anxious that our neighbours should not interfere with us.

Major DOVERE.—I live in one of these townlands, and both myself and my neighbours would be against annexation to the township, as we have gone to the expense of getting gas and water for ourselves.

19. Mr. CORROK.—Under what powers did you do that?

Major DOVERE.—We dealt directly with the city.

20. Mr. ROBINSON.—What is the valuation of these two townlands?

Mr. Arthur H. ROBINSON.—The valuation of the electoral division of Donnybrook exceeds the valuation of the Penhouse township by £4,200, so that that is the valuation of the two townlands not included.

21. Mr. VERNON.—A great portion of Priesthouse belongs to the chief owner of Fenchurch—the Earl of Pembroke.

22. Mr. CORROK.—All the statistics of the township are already on record in Mr. Vernon's evidence, the statement by Mr. Walker, Q.C., and the evidence of Mr. A. H. Robinson at the Dublin inquiry, and it will not therefore be necessary to repeat them; and Mr. Robinson has now told us the Commissioners seek no extension?

23. Mr. FITZGERALD.—And there is no one here from the outlying districts seeking to be annexed.

24. Major DOVERE.—I think I have expressed the opinion of those in the outlying districts. There are six houses where I live, and there are more being built.

25. Mr. VERNON.—From what I know, I should say Major DOVERE speaks the feeling of these districts.

26. Mr. CORROK.—Do you think your roads are better kept than if they were in the township?

Major DOVERE.—They are very well kept; they are sufficiently well kept by the county; there is not much traffic there.

27. Mr. CORROK.—You have gas and water by contract—did you contribute to the expense of laying down the mains?

Major DOVERE.—We did, to a certain extent.

28. Mr. ROBINSON.—Do you think there is any probability of any of this portion of Simmonscourt and Priesthouse being built upon?

Mr. VERNON.—Portion of Simmonscourt is being built upon.

29. Mr. CORROK.—I presume the Aylesbury-road

portion is expected to be built upon!—There are eight houses being built there at present.

30. Then you think that that portion of Simmonscourt should be included?—Yes.

31. Mr. A. H. Robinson.—There are seventeen houses in Priorthouse outside our township, and twenty-four in Simmonscourt, including six in Seaview-terrace, and not including those in course of erection.

32. Mr. Fenton.—These houses in Simmonscourt can be built at the will of the owner without any control of all!—No; Mr. Vernon watches that.

Mr. Vernon.—Yes; the secretary is quite right.

33. Mr. A. H. Robinson.—That is one of the reasons we have no by-laws as to building—Mr. Vernon has power to see to that.

34. Mr. Fenton.—I never allow the basement of any house to be lower than the road, and that is for drainage purposes.

35. Mr. Cotton.—Where exactly do you live, Major Devon?

Major Devon.—In Seaview-terrace.

36. Mr. Hobson.—You consider you have got all the advantages the township could confer?

Major Devon.—Yes, I think I have.

37. Mr. Cotton.—What rates do you pay at present?

Major Devon.—I could not tell at present; but they are much less than in the township.

38. Mr. Fenton.—You pay £a. 3d. in the £ for water, and for gas according to meter; and you pay your county rate of about 2s. 4d.

39. Mr. Fitzgerald.—So that Major Devon pays 3s. 7d. What is the rate in the township?

Mr. A. H. Robinson.—It is 3s. 3d.

40. Mr. Cotton.—You have no lamps on the roads. Your gas supply is simply in the houses?

Major Devon.—Yes; only in the houses.

41. Mr. Meade.—Half of Aylesbury-road is in the township, and half is not.

42. Mr. Cotton.—You mean half of the length?

Mr. Meade.—Yes; and one half is well lighted, and the other half is not lighted at all.

43. Mr. Cotton.—And you think it desirable that the whole of it should be in the township?

Mr. Meade.—Yes; most unquestionably.

44. Mr. Fitzgerald.—We could take in that part of Aylesbury-road, the Local Government Board could do that by provincial order.

45. Mr. Fenton.—We don't want to annex any place. We would be very glad to receive outside people, but we don't wish to compel them.

46. Mr. Meade.—Is there any evidence, Mr. Mahon, that you wish to put on record as to the cost of the roads?

Mr. A. J. Mahon, Township Surveyor.—2160 per mile is the cost as near as possible, and if anyone says they are not properly kept, I am prepared to answer him.

47. Mr. Cotton.—Is there any of the evidence given in Dublin that you wish to supplement?

Mr. Mahon.—No.

The inquiry then closed.

PAGE NO.
NO. 3, 1879
Mr. Arthur H. Robinson.

KILMAINHAM.—NOVEMBER 4TH, 1879.

Before MR. W. A. EXHAM, Q.C.

MR. HUGH HAMILTON, Town Clerk, examined.

KILMAINHAM,
Nov. 4, 1879.

Mr. Hugh Hamilton

there building ground on which buildings seem likely to be erected immediately outside the boundary of the township?—No, I think not.

21. Independently of the question as to whether you should be brought into Dublin, is there—if you were left to yourselves—any district that should be brought into you?—No, there is not.

Sir Croker Borrington.—There is nothing, I may say, but fields.

22. CHAIRMAN.—Do the Commissioners or any of the townpeople suggest that there should be any extension of the boundaries?—No.

23. Are all the houses of the railway people included?—Yes.

24. Is Ballo Cottage in Dublin?—I should think it is in the county.

25. Do you suggest that Dolphin's-barn should be brought into you?—No.

Sir Croker Borrington.—You may take it too that the Commissioners object to being brought into Dublin.

26. CHAIRMAN.—Do you pay Grand Jury rates?—No, what we pay the Grand Jury is county at large charges.

27. How much is that out of the 3s. 6d. £—5d. in the pound.

28. Have you any calculation of what it costs to keep the roads?—Yes, it costs about £150 a mile—not quite £150, perhaps I should say £120.

29. How many miles of road have you?—Foss miles of road I may say at present we expend £600.

30. What is the name of the barony?—Upper Cross.

Sir Croker Borrington was present for the Commissioners, and on the part of the Great Southern and Western Railway, and said he concurred in the evidence of Mr. Hugh Hasulon, Town Clerk.

The inquiry terminated.

DRUMCONDRA.
June 22, 1880.

DRUMCONDRA.—TUESDAY, 22ND JUNE, 1880.

Before W. A. EXLAM, Esq., Q.C.

MICHAEL PETT, Secretary to the Town Commissioners.

Michael Pett,
The Township was created under the 41 and 42 Vict. c. 157, and its boundaries are fixed by that Act. The area is 91 $\frac{1}{2}$ acres, of which about one-half has been built on, and a considerable portion of the residue is available, and likely to be built on, as building operations are going on extensively. The valuation is £13,924 15s., of which the valuation of buildings is £11,311 5s.; and land, £1,313 5s., and the residue, £490 5s., is made up of half annual rents, railways, &c. The railways pay on the full valuation. The Township is in three electoral divisions—Drumcondra, Glasnevin, and Finglas; but there are only about four acres in Finglas, which is entirely land. All the electoral divisions extend considerably beyond the boundary. There are three wards—Drumcondra, Glasnevin, and Finglas. They are valued respectively at £3,249 15s., £6,265 5s., and £3,399 10s., to which is to be added £110 for tramways and telegraph poles. There are fourteen Commissioners, made up of five for Drumcondra; five for Glasnevin; and four for Finglas. There are not any wards for Poor Law purposes. Our municipal rate for 1879 was 2s. 6d. in the £, made up of a 2s. Township rate and 6d. water rate. We are supplied with the Vartry water by contract with the Corporation at the rate of 6d. in the £ on the valuation of buildings, only deducting those which are exempted under our special Act. For this they supply 20 gallons per diem for each of our inhabitants, calculated according to present estimated population being about 3,500 and we pay 6d. per 1,000 gallons for all excess water. For the 2s. rate we light the Township, maintain and sweep the roads, and do all the necessary sanitary work. We have not struck any special sanitary rate, and have not found it necessary to do so. We paid last year for county-at-large charges £217 11s. 10d., being about 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ d. in the £ on our valuation. This year our water rate is only 6d., as we had a balance in hand from the 6d. rate of last year. Our maximum rate is 2s. in the £, but we cannot increase our Township rate of 2s. without consent of two-thirds of the ratepayers given as required by the Act. We have 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles of roads to keep, and we are able to maintain them out of our Township rate, and do all the rest of the work that is necessary. Our staff consists of myself as secretary at £72 a year; the engineer at £10 a year of a paid salary, and by fees on any structural works excepted at a cost beyond £250. We employ men to repair and sweep the roads, and we hire all necessary horse work. Our sanitary staff consists of myself as executive sanitary officer at £30 a year; a sub-officer at 12s. a week who is employed exclusively at that work; and a consulting sanitary officer; and we also have the services of the medical officers of health, but we do not pay them. We have not any mortuary or disinfecting apparatus. We have had but one case of small-pox since our Township was formed. We have not many of the poorer classes living here. Our poor rate this year was 1s. 9d. in the electoral division of Drumcondra, and 1s. 7d. for Glasnevin; and although we pay about £3,700 for poor rates on our

valuation, we only sent fourteen paupers during the last year to the Workhouse. A good many of the artisan and labouring class live here in cottages, but we have not many tenement houses in which that class of our population reside. We have a power under our Act of raising £7,000, to be charged on the Township rate for Township works; and £3,000 for water purposes, to be charged on the water rate. We have borrowed £5,000 on the Township rate from the Patriotic Insurance Company, repayable by thirty annual instalments of £166 13s. 4d., in reduction of the principal; and we pay interest on the balance due from time to time at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum. We have applied to the Local Government Board to sanction a loan of £1,000 for water purposes, which they have recommended to the Board of Works, but we have not got the money. We have not any fire brigades or fire-engines. These are hydrants all through the Township, and we have two lengths of hose, but only for filling carts for watering the streets. Our agreement with the Corporation as to the supply of water for domestic purposes is conditional on their being able to supply us. They also supply us with water for public purposes, but they can terminate this supply on giving three months notice. The Commissioners have considered in full meeting the question of my alteration of the present boundaries, and they are unanimously of opinion that no change is desirable, and that opinion is shared in by the ratepayers generally. Under the 8th section of our Act we have power to extend the boundaries in the manner therein mentioned. As already stated to you at the Dublin Inquiry, a large majority of our Commissioners are strongly opposed to any annexation of our Township to Dublin, and they have not changed their opinion in that respect. The Township rate for this year is 2s.; water rate, 6d.; and sinking fund, 6d. This being a newly-built district—and, therefore, recently valued—the Commissioners do not think that any re-valuation of our Township is necessary. Plans have been prepared by our engineer for the sewerage and main drainage of our Township, and they have been approved by Mr. Cottam, and the Local Government Board have sanctioned the loan to execute them. The proposed cost will be £2,300. At present more than half our Township is not included within the Metropolitan Police district, and we would suggest that the whole of the Township should be included. At present the ratepayers in our Township who are included in the Metropolitan Police district have to pay 8d. in the £ for Police Tax, and 2d. in the £ for Bridge Tax. £34 5s. 4d. was paid out of our rates last year to the County Grand Jury for Bridge Tax on the portion of our Township outside the limits of the Police district. This was paid by the ratepayers in both districts, as also the share of the County Police who watch the district not included in the Metropolitan district, and thus the ratepayers within the latter district pay, in fact, 8d. in the £ for Police Tax, and 2d. in the £ for Bridge Tax, more than the ratepayers outside that district.

CLONTARF.—NOVEMBER 5TH, 1879.

Before Mr. W. A. ETHERAM, Q.C., Chairman, and HENRY A. ROBINSON, Esq.

CLONTARF,
Nov. 5, 1879.

Colonel BALCOMB, Secretary Clontarf Township, examined.

1. CHAIRMAN.—Are there any wards in Clontarf?—No.

2. Can you tell me is the population increasing?—It was 3,442 in '71, and calculated to be 4,263 in '75.

3. Mr. ROBINSON.—What means had you of determining the difference?—The collector was employed in making up the figures.

4. CHAIRMAN.—Was he employed on the part of the Commissioners to take a census?—Yes.

5. Has building gone on to any considerable extent?—Well, not to a very considerable extent until very recently; but there is now a great impetus to it.

6. Can you give any details of that?—There are 25 houses uncompleted, and 60 houses have been added since the township was formed—during the last two years.

7. The township is in two electoral divisions?—Yes; Clontarf and Drumcondra.

8. Mr. ROBINSON.—Can you separate the valuations of these two?—Well, not at the present moment.

9. Does the township take in the entire of the Clontarf electoral division?—Yes.

10. And portion of Drumcondra?—I think so; but I am not sure.

11. What is the valuation?—£14,656 it was last year, but it has been altered since to £16,073 this year.

12. What have your rates been for the past four years?—In '74, 3d.; in '75, 3d.; '76, 3d.; '77, 3d. 3d.; '78, 3d. 3d.; and '79, 3d. 3d.

13. How much is the sanitary rate?—3d. on buildings, and 3d. on land. One-fourth on land.

14. Mr. ROBINSON.—Was it only for sanitary purposes you struck one-fourth?—Yes; and for all other purposes the full rate.

15. CHAIRMAN.—The full rate up to 3d., and for everything beyond that, land pays only one-half.

16. Witness.—Under our circumstances, at present none of our rates are more than 3d.

17. You say you only strike a sanitary rate of 3d. on land?—Yes; but of the township rate the land pays the full. Our rates are divided in this way, the town rate is 3d.; the land pays all that rate. Then the water rate is 6d.; the land pays all that. The sinking fund rate is 8d.

18. Why should they pay the full rate—the full water rate and the 8d. rate?—The Act does not relieve them. There is no single rate over 3d.

19. Mr. ROBINSON.—How is the rate made up?—The township rate is 2s., the water rate 4d., and the sinking fund 8d.

20. That is 3s.; and the sanitary rate is in addition to that?—Yes.

21. CHAIRMAN.—Your maximum rate is 3s.?—No; the maximum rate is 3s.

22. That includes everything?—Yes.

23. But you have no higher power than 3s.?—No.

24. Mr. ROBINSON.—Is the sanitary rate limited?—Yes.

25. CHAIRMAN.—The maximum rates you can strike are 3s.; and the 5th section of the Act declares that when the rate exceeds 2s., the lands are only to pay one-half?—When any particular rate exceeds 2s.

26. But you make rates exceeding 2s., and the land should only pay one-half?—That is not the ruling of our solicitor.

27. Mr. AUSTIN.—When we commenced first we took your view, but we were advised that it was wrong.

28. CHAIRMAN.—Do you pay the county-at-large charge out of the rates?—Yes; out of the rates.

29. How much are they?—They are now about 4d., and they were nearly 1d.

30. Have the Commissioners considered the question of the alteration of the boundaries?—Yes; they have.

31. Are they unanimous on the point?—Yes; that they should remain as they are.

32. Do they think there should not be any extension?—No extension or alteration.

33. Are there any houses outside, or any district properly called a building district outside your present boundary?—Not immediately.

34. Mr. ROBINSON.—Do the Commissioners consider that there is sufficient land within the boundary available for building?—I believe so.

35. CHAIRMAN.—What number of acres are there unbuilt on in the present boundary?—I could not answer that question off hand. There are 1,290 acres altogether, and quite three-fourths of it, more than that, are unbuilt on.

36. What road is your boundary?—The road to Geogreen—Philipaburg—Avon. From that avenue to Geogreen, the road is in the boundary of the township, but the township is under obligation at present to maintain the entire road without contribution from the Grand Jury.

Mr. JOHN R. VERNON, D.L., examined.

Mr. JOHN R.
VERNON, D.L.

37. CHAIRMAN.—You complain with reference to the sea wall boundary?—Yes; we are bound to keep up that wall which was formerly maintained by the Grand Jury. We have spent £1,200 in maintaining it. It is a very unsatisfactory wall, and we cannot trace who built it originally.

38. Is the road bounded by that wall largely used by the county at large?—Yes, and by the city too, and we think that the city ought to contribute towards it.

39. The main road goes to Raheny and Howth?—Yes.

40. Is the maximum rate, or the rate you have been striking sufficient to keep up the township as it ought to be?—Well, so far as I am myself personally concerned I would like to add on 6d. more to our rating powers.

41. That would bring you up to 3s. 6d.?—Yes. It would enable us to do things we are not enabled to do at present.

42. Mr. ROBINSON.—Are there many things you have been prevented from carrying out?—We would

give increased lighting if we had more money. We have to restrict it.

43. In which direction is it required?—At some of the extreme ends—and during certain parts of the year we don't light the township at all from inability to support the expense of lighting.

44. Is the township properly drained in your opinion?—Well, I don't believe almost any township is properly drained. We are, however, continually improving it.

45. Have you any drainage for your drainage?—No, except the forecourt.

46. Well, we need not go into that question, for we have discussed it at some length before. The sea wall you regard as an important point?

47. Decidedly it is a great burden on the township because we did not anticipate such an expenditure to keep it up, and after all it is only holding it, for it is a rotten wall. We think that if it was not taken altogether by the county at large or the Port and Docks Board—who claim the ownership of the shore—that at

CHAIRMAN.
Nov. 5, 1879
Mr. John R.
Vernon, D.C.

all events they ought to contribute one half of the maintenance of it. We think the first thing to do would be to put it on the county at large. It would be a small charge in that way. It was originally on the county at large and they repudiated it by a majority, and it was thrown on Cooleck.

48. Mr. Graham Leson.—The Commissioners are unanimous in thinking it should be on the county at large.

49. CHAIRMAN.—The county at large you may be

sure are unanimous in thinking it should be on you.

50. Mr. Austin.—I was going to say that originally the charge was on the county at large. It was considered too heavy a charge. If the county take it over again we will pay our proportion of the county charge.

51. Mr. Leson.—When the township was formed the county rate was 2s. 2d., and now the Commissioners have to support the roads, light the township, and so forth, out of 2s.

Mr. John R.
Vernon.

52. CHAIRMAN.—Are you a rate-payer?—Yes, I live a short distance from Hollybrook-park. I wish, just in consequence of an observation that fell from the Chairman of the Township, to state a few matters to show that the township appears to me to have an insufficient income to do justice to the requirements of the township. Now the Rathay-road close to us is a road that perhaps requires light more than any in the whole district, for it passes under a railway arch and has on either side of it high walls, and on a dark night in winter you have absolutely to feel your way—there is no light except a lamp at the crossing. There are no lights along that road, which requires it more than any other in the township. Along the St. Lawrence's-road there is no light till you get to Sir Ralph Cusack's place—until you reach his gate.

53. CHAIRMAN.—How does he manage about it?—He pays for light for himself. Mr. Black has to pay for another.

54. Mr. Vernon.—Sir Ralph Cusack's house is outside the township.

55. CHAIRMAN.—Have the Commissioners laid the pipes to the extreme end of the township?—Yes.

56. Mr. Leson.—Mr. Black takes his light up the Howth-road.

57. CHAIRMAN.—Are the pipes laid up through the main roads?

Mr. Hunter.—No.

58. Mr. Leson.—They are only laid up Castle-street so far as that district is concerned.

59. CHAIRMAN.—Is the main road—up the Howth-road—not lighted?

Mr. Leson.—No, only a short distance.

60. CHAIRMAN.—Would you say, Mr. Hunter, that considering all these circumstances the lighting is insufficient for the requirements of the township?—Indeedly, and I attribute that to want of sufficient funds. There is another thing I wish to say. Hollybrook-park consists of seven houses, and they pay taxes, but they are not supplied with water. It is not a thoroughfare—it is an avenue leading off the Howth-road.

61. CHAIRMAN.—Are they rated?—Yes.

62. Do they pay water rates?—Yes, and except the fountain on the road which is very inconvenient they have no supply.

63. Mr. Vernon.—We put the water within their reach, and then it is in their power to subscribe so as to have the supply to their houses.

64. Mr. Leson.—It is generally considered that there ought to be an extra expense put on to enable them to do these things.

65. CHAIRMAN.—But you would not be at liberty to apply any of that sixpenny rate to water.

66. Mr. Austin.—When we undertook the administration of this Act, and took the duties and responsibilities of the county, this place, that has been referred to, was a *rel de sac*. The Grand Jury of the county did not do anything for it—they did not repair the road inside the enclosure, nor give sewers, nor in fact anything.

67. CHAIRMAN.—But if you levy a water rate and yet don't give them water, what do you say?

68. Mr. Hunter.—I don't know whether I am correct in saying so, but I heard that under the

Public Health Act of last year the *rel de sac* of Holbrook-park is the same as any place else.

69. CHAIRMAN.—The only thing is they should perhaps strike a water rate. I suppose the inhabitants who are interested would rather pay that than not get it!

70. Mr. Hunter.—Yes, the inhabitants in fact would rather consent to be taxed for it.

71. Mr. Leson.—The Board here would be willing to do a great many things that Mr. Hunter and other gentlemen complain of if we had the means, and for that purpose we want a little added to our rate.

72. The Clerk of the Commissioners.—Hollybrook park is considered private property.

73. CHAIRMAN.—Why rate it then—every bit of ground in the township is private property if you go to that?

The Clerk.—Take St. Anne's—the water is taken out of the public road. The owner takes it into his own grounds. It is the same in Clerkenwell castle. He takes it at his own expense from the public road.

74. Mr. Leson.—What we would be willing to do is to leave the water at every man's door and let him take it in himself as in Dublin.

75. CHAIRMAN.—The only thing is whether the Commissioners should not increase their taxation for water purposes.

76. Mr. Vernon.—We do not think we are bound to bring water into a man's private residence.

77. Mr. Hunter.—There are detached houses with ground all round them with gates and so on, and people who require to have it should in such cases bring it up from the public road. But the avenues I speak of is public to everyone.

78. CHAIRMAN.—Wherever there is a public street or avenue they are bound to run the water mains along it.

79. The Clerk.—There is no public street there.

80. Mr. Austin.—Is there not a gate-lodge?

Mr. Hunter.—No one can keep the gate shut. There is a gate-lodge but it is empty. The public can drive over it into the avenue.

81. Mr. Madan.—The township is in a very unprotected state.

82. Mr. Hunter.—Within the past two months and within a stone's-throw of the Commissioners' office there were three robberies committed. There was one robbery of a cow taken at night from the rear of one of those houses on this road, and never heard of since. It was taken while the family were asleep. Another robbery took place at Anderson's publisht, and the police came and secured themselves in the house and captured someone making a second raid. Another robbery was at Mr. Williams' where a number of valuable fowl and things were taken by people coming over the wall.

83. CHAIRMAN.—You say the protection of the place is not sufficient?—Yes.

84. Is there not a police station?—Yes, at Fairview. They will come when they are told of a robbery and try and detect the robber, but prevention is not attempted at all by them. There is no such thing as police walking about.

85. Would you suggest that the Metropolitan Police District should be extended whether you are

added to Dublin or not!—Yes, for now a man has to depend upon himself for protection.

86. Mr. Heard, s.t., &c.—There are two Constabulary stations in the township, and there are two officers and eighteen men, and I can show you that within the last twelve months—from the 1st of November, 1878, to the 31st October, 1879—there were 218 patrols by day, and by night leaving before 10 o'clock at night 621, and leaving after 10 o'clock a.m. 241, total 1780 patrols. Irrespective of that there were from 10 o'clock to 10 o'clock men doing beat duty, besides men moving through the district.

87. CHAIRMAN.—Can you tell me, suppose the township was under the Metropolitan Police, how many men would be added?

Mr. Heard.—I am sure there would not be more than at present.

88. Mr. Austin.—About two and a half years ago there was a robbery committed on some of my property. One of my houses had the entire of the lead stripped off the roof at night, and a most singular thing occurred, I got the house redone and it was carried away again. That looked as if there was really no supervision against such offences. I may mention that I went to the Constabulary station, and there were, at that particular time, only two constables at Ballybough.

89. Mr. Heard.—At that time there was a disturbance at Belfast, and the men were called away. The worst characters are at Ballybough.

90. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing offences are committed, and arrests made, where are they taken to?—Coolock Petty Sessions.

91. How far off is that?—Two miles.

92. And how often are the sessions held?—Once a fortnight.

93. Would it not be an advantage to have Clontarf under the control of the Metropolitan Police?—Well, it seems to work very well at Coolock—there are a great many convictions there.

94. You would not get additional police unless you paid for them!

Mr. Heard.—No, the present forces are paid out of the Consolidated Fund.

95. Mr. Lewis.—Do you think there should be more police under your command?—I think not. This district compared with others is wonderfully free from crime.

96. Mr. Hunter.—I think it is the system of the

Metropolitan that is wanted more than anything else. There should be beats.

Mr. Heard.—There are beats.

97. Mr. P. Kennedy.—I wish to say, with reference to the drainage which exists, and which is at present being delivered from Mr. Donnelly's land to the Tolka, there was an agreement made between the High-Park Convent, the Clontarf Commissioners, and Mr. Donnelly that the pipe was to run through his land for twenty years, and the time is now, with the exception of two years, expired, and Mr. Donnelly tells me he would meet the proposition liberally to provide another outfall for this sewage before the two-year clause.

98. CHAIRMAN.—The sewage at that spot appears to be in an unsatisfactory condition. If the Clontarf Commissioners are the urban sanitary authority they can provide for it.

99. Mr. Kennedy.—If the Commissioners would not give any opposition to the outfall proposal, it would be a great thing.

100. CHAIRMAN.—Before the two years are up there will, very probably, be very extensive legislation on this subject.

101. Mr. Lewis.—From what I know of the feeling of the Commissioners they are perfectly willing to meet Mr. Kennedy as far as the funds are concerned.

102. Mr. Kennedy.—We would join you liberally if the Board would take the question into consideration. It would be a great matter to settle it.

103. Mr. Biggar.—This £2 rate is not sufficient for our purposes, and I quite agree with these gentlemen who stated that we required an increase on that to enable the affairs of the township to be properly managed. I think that there should be at least £4 additional.

104. Mr. Densell.—I can distinctly prove, as I did on a former occasion, that during the past few years the Corporation diverted a large amount of sewage into the Tolka and to my property. I am in favour of annexation.

105. Mr. Tisdall.—I must express my dissent from what has been stated regarding the police. I think they are a model force here, and ladies may walk in safety along the roads at any hour.

106. Mr. Densell.—That is certainly not my experience.

The inquiry then terminated.

CLOSED,
Nov. 3, 1879.

Mr. John
Hunter.

KINGSTOWN.—AUGUST 26TH, 1879.

Before Messrs. W. A. EXHAM, Q.C., and C. P. COTTON, C.B.

Mr. R. J. ENNIS, examined.

KINGSTOWN.

Aug. 26, 1879.

Mr. R. J.
Ennis.

1. CHAIRMAN.—You are Town Clerk of Kingstown?—Yes.

2. What is the population of Kingstown?—17,518 according to the Census of 1871.

3. It is an increasing population?—Yes; and I would estimate it at about 22,000 at present. The area is 1,447 acres 1 rood thirty-three perches, and the valuation £73,472, to which must be added that of Government buildings in the township, on which the Treasury pay in lieu of rates £137.

4. Of that £73,000 how much is buildings and how much is land?—The valuation of land and railways which are rated at one-fourth comes to £6,482 £s.

5. The boundaries were originally fixed by the 3rd and 4th of Wm. IV. t.—Yes. That was the boundaries of Kingstown proper, but Clonliffe was subsequently added in 1854 under the Act of 1854.

6. Did the boundaries remain the same from 1854 to 1874?—Yes; until the Act of 1874.

7. Were the boundaries then extended further?—Yes; as they now exist.

8. Were the queries we sent down submitted to the

Commissioners?—They were submitted to a full meeting of the Board, and they were referred to a committee to prepare answers. The Commissioners present expressed their views generally on the subject, and the Committee brought up the answers which you have received. At a meeting held on the 18th April last these answers were unanimously agreed to. There was not a large meeting of the Board, but the answers really conveyed the general feelings of the general body of the Commissioners. To that there was only one exception, and that was by one Commissioner, Mr. Crosthwaite, who has some interest in property in Rostertown, and having a fancy for municipal government he wished that place to be brought in, but the Commissioners declined to accede to his wish.

9. In considering the question of extension, was it understood that the present system of municipal government was to be the same?—They only went into the question of the boundary. They did not go into the question of new government or finance.

10. Everything to remain as it is?—Yes.

2 O 2

Kingsdown
Aug. 26, 1879.
Mr. R. J.
Eccles.

11. Was it for the benefit of the town rates that this place was taken in in 1874?—I would not answer that in the negative or affirmative.

12. Is the entire of the township within the Metropolitan Police District?—It is.

13. What is the valuation of the wards?—The valuations of the wards, omitting gas and water mains which are uniform through the township, are Glasthule, £16,628; Kingstown East, £31,933 12s.; West Ward, £20,630; and Monkstown, £12,890 12s. To that must be added what makes up the great total of £73,472, namely, £837 for gas mains, £565 for water mains, and £737 for treasury grant. Glasthule, Kingstown East and West Wards, all return the same number of Commissioners—six each, and Monkstown ward three.

14. Is it considered fair that Glasthule should return the same number of Commissioners as the East and West wards when its valuation is so much less?—That was a matter of great contention before Committee of the House of Commons, and last in 1869, when it was then settled. I think one reason is, that Glasthule is capable of great extension, and it is being built upon every day.

15. Has not Kingstown West more building ground?—Yes.

16. Have the Commissioners considered whether any alteration is desirable in the wards?—They think that after the great trouble to settle them in 1869 there is no necessity to alter them now.

17. Have they had the matter under consideration?—No.

18. Is there not a very large district of building ground in Monkstown ward unbuilt upon?—That applies to all the wards. Of course there is a great deal unbuilt upon in Monkstown.

19. Under your Act what does the railway pay?—Only one-fourth.

20. What are your present debts?—We owe a balance on foot of a loan of £16,000, obtained for water supply to the town in 1870. That amounts to £12,800.

21. That is being paid off by a sinking fund?—Yes; £400 a year. We owe £8,000 loan, obtained to build a new Town Hall and Court-house. We also owe a balance of £10,000, obtained in 1876 for sewage. There is a proportion of that paid off by sinking fund of about £2 per cent. per annum, and that is wiping that out since 1876.

22. Are these your entire debts?—Yes.

23. Are all these charged at the general rate?—Yes, except the sewage loan which is repaid by a special sewage rate. We also owe £3,000 for asphalting. We have paid off some of it; and £1,300 for pipe laying in extra districts of the township. In each of these cases we have repaid since obtaining the loans annual instalments at the rate of 3 per cent. on the moneys obtained for sewage and pipe laying in the extra district; and at a somewhat higher rate on the loans obtained for other purposes.

24. Have you water laid through the entire township?—Yes, and even through the new district.

25. Do you light it all?—Yes; we put lamps all through the township, but not in such numbers where the places are not thickly populated.

26. Do the rated occupiers pay the same in these districts as in the centre of the town?—There is no variation of the rates.

27. What is your contract with the Corporation for the supply of water?—5d. in the pound on the valuation.

28. Is the water supply always on?—Always on, so far as the Corporation can give it, but we turn it off, not altogether, every night, in order to check the excessive consumption. We don't turn it off altogether; we only reduce the pressure.

29. Do you mean that everyone in Kingstown can draw water during the night, but at a reduced pressure?—Yes; we have one-eighth left on constantly, and then in the morning we turn it on full.

30. Would it reach every house in Kingstown at night?—No, it would not reach the houses in the higher districts.

31. What authority have you for turning it off—is not that directly contrary to law?—I am not aware it is. We don't turn it completely off. If we did not do so the extra rate required at the present charge of 3d. per thousand gallons to pay for the excess would reach 2d. or 3d. in the pound per annum. It is in order to avoid that we are taking these precautions. It is only a temporary movement. We have issued placards and notices, and we are gradually cutting down this excess consumption. Our statutable allowance is 20,000 gallons per diem, but we use sometimes 35,000 gallons. We say statutable allowance because it is mentioned in the contract. I may state that I have not received, since that contract was adopted, a dozen complaints from distinct individuals in connection with the turning off of the water.

32. For instance, take De Voei-terrace and the other terraces about there?—I only got two complaints altogether from De Voei-terrace, and one from Longford-terrace.

33. But have they not water?—They have not the same pressure.

34. Have the people in Vesey-place got it?—Yes, and since they find they will be deprived of the water by night they will shut down their valves and prevent waste. We are appealing to them both ways, to their sense by putting down the valves, and to their feelings by placards, but this is only a temporary measure altogether.

35. How would you manage if a fire broke out?—We have everything in perfect order for that.

36. How far is the valve where the water is turned off from the Town Hall?—It is at York-street; so that our men as soon as the least alarm is given can turn on the water. The first thing to be done is to notice him.

37. Where does he live?—In Sussex-street, where the appliances are.

38. How far is that from the valve where he would have to go to?—He would walk it in about six or seven minutes, and while the other man would be getting ready the fire appliances he would have the valve turned on. That matter was gravely discussed before the order was made, and tried several times. We have also an arrangement with the police, as they would naturally be the first to receive intimation of a fire at night, whom to call upon at once; they have the address of our water inspector and other parties, and just a fortnight ago we got a fire escape on the best principle.

39. Is the valve locked down?—No; the man goes with a key and turns it on at once.

40. It is a water meter chamber?—No; it is always on there.

41. Have you any fire-brigade?—Of course you are aware that whenever there is a gassed ship the men on board are regularly trained to put out fires in the district to which they are attached, so we can fall back upon that. Our own men are very expert with the hose, and we have water at high pressure; it is only a matter of turning on the valve.

42. You had a trial of the hose some time ago?—Yes, and with the fire engine also. The fire engine was a failure, but the hose worked perfectly. We have 600 feet of hose, and we have arranged with Captain Ingram to train as many men as we send in in the working of the hose, fire escape, and so on.

43. Some people are of opinion that the fire brigade of Dublin should be co-extensive with the Metropolitan Police district in the same way as in London and paid for by the whole area. What would you say to a rate in aid from Kingstown for the use of the fire brigade in return?—Dublin is too far away.

44. But London is twenty-two miles?—They have stations.

45. Exactly, and there is a proposal to have a fire brigade in each of the stations—Blackrock, Kingstown,

and so on!—The reply of the Commissioners to all that would be very emphatic; they would not like to have it because it would be a precedent to have anything to do with the ratepayers of the Dublin Corporation, and they are opposed to that.

46. At present you have to pay 3d. to the Dublin Corporation for the bridge tax!—We do, but we are aware how that was got through. The Dublin Metropolitan district seemed very natural in the Committee of the House of Commons, but they did not know that they were going outside the city of Dublin.

47. What is your maximum rating power!—We have not approached it. Our improvement rate is only 1s. 3d. now, and we have power to raise 2s.

48. Are you able to do road making and scavenging with that!—No; we have 1s. 6d. for that, and we have power to go up to 2s. 6d.

49. What are the different rates!—Improvement rate 2s., that is the maximum, 1s. 6d. road rate, and under certain conditions 2s. 6d.

50. What are the conditions!—The calling of a meeting and obtaining the consent of the majority of the ratepayers, and as to the sewer rate, of course we are not limited.

51. What are the county at large charges!—We pay that out of our road rate. We don't make a distinct rate for that, the 1s. 6d. covers it.

52. How much of the 1s. 6d. has been left for the roads!—From 8d. to 10d., for all the expenses connected with the roads.

53. Are you able to keep all the roads for that!—One penny in the pound brings in £180, and that will explain why from 8d. to 10d. is sufficient.

54. Some people in Dublin propose that there should be a rate thrown over the whole metropolitan district, towards what are called metropolitan improvements, in the same way as in the metropolitan district in London!

55. Mr. R. Herren, J.P., Chairman Township Commissioner.—However we might not object to acting in conjunction with Blackrock and Dalkey, the feeling of the entire township is against having anything directly or indirectly to do with the Dublin Corporation.

56. You have nothing to do with them except that you pay 2d. for bridges in the city!

Mr. Ennis.—We pay that to the Port and Docks Board and not to the Corporation.

57. Every person in the London metropolitan district has to pay the same rate for metropolitan improvements, is it your opinion that in the Dublin metropolitan district they should not contribute anything!—My idea is, knowing London pretty well and the mode of management there, that London is so exceptional in every respect that no analogy is possible between it and say other place.

58. I don't know that the people of Woolwich have to pay for the Thames embankment, on the ground that it is a metropolitan improvement!—You cannot possibly take it that Kingstown is attached to Dublin in the same way as Woolwich is to London.

59. Why not!—Because there is no marked line of separation between London and Woolwich.

60. And what is the distinct line between Dublin and Kingstown, it is not one mass of buildings from Dublin to Dalkey!—No, your argument would apply to Rathmines, Pimlico, and Kilmainham, but there is a very bold distinct line at Booterstown.

61. It is gradually being built upon!—The better way to carry out the idea would be to have a county charge for charge, Dublin improvements.

62. But you cannot call yourself the county at large, for you are formed into a township!

63. Mr. Hayes Kelly, Township Commissioner, Kingstown.—You might as well say Bray was part of Dublin for it is only six miles further on. We don't benefit by any improvements in the city of Dublin.

64. Have you calculated at all the number of people in Kingstown who carry on business in Dublin!—I never went into it, but I could give an idea of it.

65. Are they not very considerable!—No; very few indeed. You would be surprised at the number.

66. Don't you see a large number of business people getting into Dublin in the morning!—You see a considerable number, but I would not say a large number.

67. Mr. John McEvoy, Town Commissioner, Kingstown.—I think if there was an examination made in the township it would be found that the people living in them were people of independent means who came up from the country, and like to live in a place half town, half country, near a city.

68. Mr. Cotton.—I wonder the Rathmines people did not attempt to prove that, because they seemed to accede to the proposition that the residents were almost all city business people.

69. Mr. Ennis.—Not more than 5 per cent of the population of Kingstown go in to business in the city.

70. Mr. McEvoy.—I would say more, about one-third of the houses are occupied by people who come under the category of those having some office in the city, and the remaining two-thirds do not.

71. Are the majority of the remainder people who are supplying them with what they require!—Yes, and the others are people who have selected Kingstown as a place to live in.

72. Where does Kingstown draw its supplies from?

Mr. Evans.—The port of Dublin is really the importation of this district, of course.

73. Is not the port of Dublin, in point of fact, the port for Kingstown except for coal!—Yes, we have our own supply of timber and coal.

74. Don't the supplies for the grocers, bakers, and butchers, come through Dublin!—To a great extent, the port of Dublin is the medium of supplying articles of consumption in Kingstown to a very large extent.

75. And for Dalkey and Blackrock, and all those adjoining townships!—Dalkey draws a great many supplies from us.

76. You, and are they not brought into Dublin and conveyed in carts from that to the townships!—Yes, and that is the reason why we contribute to the Rock road.

77. That is, because you use it so largely!—And the people of Dublin use Kingstown very largely also. Kingstown is assisting the Dublin people to pay their rates by the profit they afford them by dealing with them.

78. Mr. Kelly.—Last year we made a reduction of 3d. in the pound in the rates, so that instead of getting into debt we are getting out of it.

79. Mr. Cotton.—Was not that in consequence of the altered management about the water?

80. Mr. Kelly.—No.

81. Mr. Cotton.—I understood Mr. Ennis to say, that if the excessive consumption went on they would have to pay 3d. or 3s. in the £ extra!

82. Mr. Ennis.—The Corporation claimed it, but we did not pay it.

83. CHAIRMAN.—On no condition would you like to be attached to the Corporation of Dublin?

Mr. Ennis.—No.

84. Mr. McEvoy.—We are unanimous in that.

85. Mr. Kelly.—There are 99 out of every 100 in the township against it.

86. Mr. Ennis.—It would be very far fetched to have any metropolitan improvements levied beyond the criss at Blackrock.

87. Mr. Kelly.—I would be sorry to see Blackrock attached to Dublin, but as a citizen of Kingstown I think Dublin has a right to attach Pimlico and the other outlying townships, for they all form one city.

88. CHAIRMAN.—What do you say to the keeping up of the roads and police?

Mr. Ennis.—We have our own police barracks with a distinct superintendent and everything separate and it is just the same as if we had to pay the constabulary rate. In this way we get a direct tangible benefit for that 8d. in the pound police rate, and if we had to support our own police it would cost us more.

KINGSTOWN
Aug 25, 1876.
Mr. R. J.
Ennis

KINGSTOWN,
Aug 26, 1879.
Mr. B. J.
Kerr.

88. But why not contribute towards keeping up the metropolis from which you draw your supplies?—How would you draw the line as to the purpose for which the rate is to be expended?

89. In keeping up the streets through which the supplies come?—We should keep part of the rate for our own township also.

90. No, because they don't draw supplies from you at all, while you set up their streets and injure them!—The heavy loads from the wholesale houses injure our streets; we have to pay for them and the Dublin merchant has the profit.

91. Do not the Kingstown people largely go into Dublin to theatres, &c., and use the streets of the city with cabs and other vehicles?—We have a place here, and we have Killiney Hill and other attractions, which bring the people of Dublin out here so that the picture can be reversed in that way. With the exception perhaps of Mr. McEvoy I think all the arguments you have used would fail to convince the Board that the proposal was a fair one.

92. Have the Board considered whether it would be of advantage to Kingstown, Blackrock, and Dalkey that they should be united at least for drainage and fire brigades purposes?—The question of such union was never considered. The only question was the general question of extension. The question of the amalgamation of the townships of Blackrock and Dalkey with Kingstown although frequently discussed by individual members was never formally considered. The members seemed to agree that they would as soon let masters stay as they are, but the question of union with the object you state I never heard discussed at all.

93. Mr. McEvoy.—Was not the proposal under the main drainage scheme to take in Blackrock and give them representation?

Mr. Kerr.—That was for a drainage board.

94. Mr. McEvoy.—It was considered then?

Mr. Kerr.—Yes, in 1872 and 1873 it was under consideration but the project fell through and we are now going under the Act of 1878 for the main drainage of the district.

95. Mr. Cotton.—And does not the Act of 1878 give power to form a united district for the purposes of drainage?—It does, but it says where there are two districts to be united which were before separate the contributions of each are to be settled by arbit-

tration by the Local Government Board. It cannot be denied that Blackrock, Kingstown, and Dalkey form one compact district and there is no well defined boundary between the three. They are all within the same drainage area.

96. CHAIRMAN.—What are the objections to the union?—I would suggest that what you have now thrown out should be laid before the Commissioners of Kingstown and if you adjourned the inquiry to a future day the matter could be considered in the mean time.

97. The principle on which the townships around Dublin should be annexed to the city if recommended by us would compel us to deal with Kingstown and Blackrock in a similar way!—The analogy I think is very close. The question however has never been discussed here, we did not know the scope of your inquiry.

98. Mr. Kelly.—We would not like to hamper our ratepayers with liabilities for money which we think was badly spent. We would like to know the liabilities and the taxes of these places before we went into the question. So far as we are concerned there is no fear of our asking to have these places annexed. There is no more healthy town in Ireland or better drained.

99. Mr. McEvoy.—If it be taken as part of a large scheme of municipal reform I would be in favour of uniting Kingstown, Blackrock, and Dalkey, and I think I would add Killiney. Let them form one township; but if the proposal is nothing more than that Kingstown being the larger should swallow up the other, I would be against extension. I could give a great many arguments in favour of it, but I would like the Dalkey and Blackrock people to be heard.

100. CHAIRMAN.—Would you have any objection to let it go down upon our notes that you suggest or approve of a suggestion to amalgamate the townships, then we can give notice that having been suggested at this inquiry an opportunity will be given at a future day to consider the subject, and we can request the Commissioners of Dalkey and Blackrock to attend in order to discuss the matter.

101. Mr. McEvoy.—I have no objection; it being taken down in my words—as part of a great scheme for municipal reform.

The inquiry was then adjourned until Tuesday, 16th September.

SEPTEMBER 16TH, 1879.

Before Messrs. W. A. ERKIN, Q.C., and C. P. COTTON, Q.C.

Mr. Lewis, Town Clerk, handed in statistics of the different wards of Kingstown, and the valuations number of souls and of qualified voters, number of voters qualified to be Commissioners, and a return of the rates for the last six years. (See Appendix, No. 39.)

Mr. Anthony O'Neill handed in a resolution of the Dalkey Commissioners, dated 1st September. (See Appendix, No. 39.)

111. CHAIRMAN.—On the part of the Township of Kingstown, as far as you are aware, have your Board any objection that Blackrock and Dalkey should be added to your township?

Mr. Heron, Chairman of the Kingstown Commissioners.—As far as I know they have no objection.

112. Mr. Joseph W. Foley, A.P.—I am a Commissioner of Kingstown, and I would like to consider as to the terms upon which amalgamation should take place.

113. Mr. Heron.—We have not considered that wide and important question as to the terms upon which amalgamation should take place, but I would say, personally, that each district ought to bear and be accountable for its own debts, until they are wiped out,

before any rate could be struck for the amalgamated area.

114. CHAIRMAN.—Is that your individual view?—Yes.

115. And that, in future, the expense should be thrown over the entire area?—Yes.

116. And that, as far as possible, the expense of lighting, cleansing, and scavenging, and of sanitary improvement should be thrown over the entire district with a common rate?—That is so.

117. Mr. Myles Kelly.—The valuation of the electoral division of Kingstown, within the municipal boundary, is £72,610.

118. Mr. Cotton.—It is returned as £74,200!—My return is from the books of the clerk of the Rathdown Union.

119. That includes the property on which rates should be struck?—Well, that is the valuation of the Kingstown township. The valuation of the part of the electoral division of Kingstown in Blackrock is £10,185, and of the part in Dalkey £5,116. The portions of the electoral divisions outside the township altogether are valued at £150. That is in the rural district, making the total valuation of the electoral division of Kingstown £85,161.

120. CHAIRMAN.—Is it your opinion that the whole of the electoral division should be in Kingstown?—Yes, and my particular reason is, that we are most anxious to carry out the Main Drainage, and we find difficulty in doing so in several ways. We even, at present, have the tenders for making what is called the West Pier outfall sewer, and we are in negotiation with the Blackrock Commissioners in reference to that. We have had law suits with them with regard to the pollution of a river which runs through their township into ours. The Blackrock township runs in upon our township, and with regard to the natural drainage way, we are the proper parties to drain the district, for the natural outfall is on the West Pier. The Blackrock people are anxious for that, but we have not completed our negotiations with them yet. Another thing which has caused a dispute is as to the pollution of the Strandbrook stream, about which we have a suit of some standing, and we find it very awkward to have one part of the electoral division kept in repair by the Blackrock Commissioners and another part by the Kingstown Commissioners. The road divides the two townships, and we light and repair one-half, while it is all within our own electoral division by a long way.

121. Do the two sets of scavengers meet on the road?—Yes, and have a friendly conversation, and read the news to each other.

122. Mr. CORROZ.—Do you mean that you maintain one half of the width of the road?—No, it is divided in two by the length, and the reason I am anxious we should have a regular boundary is to do away with this altogether.

123. CHAIRMAN.—Well, isn't that a strong reason for amalgamation?—I don't intend to give evidence on that at all, because we have not properly discussed it. We were given to understand that the Dalkey Commissioners do not wish to touch Kingstown and the Blackrock Commissioners the same, and I would leave them to themselves, giving us the portions of the electoral division in their township.

124. Mr. CORROZ.—But that would be taking half of their boundary away!

125. Mr. O'ROURKE, T.C., Blackrock.—That would take the best part of our township.

126. Mr. KELLY.—Monkstown ward has two sets of Commissioners, and one half sits here and the other half in Blackrock, but if we had the electoral division they would all sit here. I would be anxious to give three Commissioners to that part of Blackrock, which would make the valuation of that portion of Monkstown the same as the other wards. The reason for wishing the electoral division brought in, so far as it relates to Dalkey, is more serious than in the case of Blackrock, for we wish to make an outfall sewer in our electoral division, but the Dalkey Commissioners will not let us go near them. We have offered them a road for the use of their sewer through the whole of Glashanly district, but they would not hear of it at all. If we had the electoral division we would have a right to make the outfall. We only want power to take in what belongs to us of our electoral division in the Dalkey township, and then the Kingstown Township would be formed according to the electoral division boundary. I don't say that these gentlemen should not be paid the expense they were put to both in Blackrock and Dalkey for lamps and water mains.

127. Mr. PARKINSON, T.C., Dalkey.—There is a most prominent promontory into the sea at Sandycove, and there are greater currents in Dalkey sound, and I don't think that the Dalkey Commissioners were sufficient vigilants in making inquiry about the matter of the outfall, and they did not produce sufficient evidence as to the currents, and I would ask Mr. Kelly is not it his reason for wishing this change that he wishes to put the sewage of his township outside the district?

128. Mr. KELLY.—We wish to put it in the electoral division of Kingstown, and the Local Government Board refused to give us permission to discharge at Sandycove point.

129. Mr. PARKINSON.—I thought you might be

under the impression that Bullock was more prominent than Sandycove!—Yes; but there is no current there.

130. Mr. PARKINSON.—I have been there for years and there is a strong current.

131. Mr. KELLY.—This is all a sentimental grievance.

Mr. O'NEILL.—What is the valuation of Glashanly?

132. Mr. KELLY.—I don't know.

133. Mr. O'NEILL.—It is £16,000, which is £5,000 greater than the valuation of Dalkey, and supposing you were to go to Dalkey and take away £5,116 of the valuation of it you will make Glashanly ward £18,000, and then you will be taking the sewage of this place with this £18,000 valuation, and throwing it into Dalkey, and that is really the object in view and that would destroy Dalkey altogether.

134. Mr. KELLY.—I merely wish to comply with the recommendation of the Committee of the House of Commons, and make the electoral divisions and the municipal boundary coincident, and I propose to do that and compensate the township for any expense they have been put to in the parts that will be included in the township.

135. Mr. O'NEILL.—But we say that the object of getting that piece cut off Dalkey is to throw in the sewage of Kingstown into Dalkey township and destroy it.

136. Mr. Myles BURKE, Commissioner, Dalkey.—We have borrowed a considerable sum of money from Government, and the money of course has been raised partly on the portion that Mr. Kelly proposed to take away and how would that be settled.

137. CHAIRMAN.—The only way would be to take an account of the valuation of each portion and make the proportion for which the added district would be liable, chargeable to the enlarged Kingstown township.

138. Mr. KELLY.—I am going in for the fair principle and would leave details to be considered afterwards. I would like our Board to have an opportunity of considering the question, for there are many conditions to consider, for instance, Blackrock township has an £8 franchise and we have a £4 franchise, and in Dalkey the same thing exists.

139. CHAIRMAN.—Would the Blackrock people have any objection to reduce their franchise to £4?

140. Captain BATHAM, T.C., Blackrock.—I would be very sorry to do that.

141. Mr. PARKINSON.—We were very sorry we ever placed it at £4 in Dalkey.

142. CHAIRMAN.—When that question comes to be discussed hereafter there will be very little difficulty in dealing with it. I would like to know why the Blackrock franchise is £8?

Captain BATHAM.—Because it works well.

143. Mr. KELLY.—It is to be understood that under no circumstances would we take in Blackrock with an £8 franchise.

144. Mr. BURKE.—I think if the people of Dalkey were canvassed they would prefer to have the franchise as it is.

145. Mr. PARKINSON.—There are some Boards who are sorry they ever fixed it at £4.

146. Mr. BURKE.—If you take away the portion proposed from Dalkey you would reduce the valuation to such a small sum that we could never carry on the township business.

147. Mr. KELLY.—We only take away £9,000 of the valuation, and they could take in Ballybrack into Dalkey.

148. Mr. O'NEILL.—If you take in Dalkey we might go in for taking up the whole of Killiney on the same principle, for it is all Killiney division.

149. Mr. PARKINSON.—It would be a most unfair thing to take away any of our township unless you give us an equivalent.

150. CHAIRMAN.—Suppose we came to the conclusion that it is desirable to amalgamate the three townships, what would be your view as to the rates and debts?

151. Mr. PARKINSON.—I would leave the debts of

Kingswear,
Sept 14, 1882.
Mr. R. J.
Barr.

KINGSTOWN,
Sept. 16, 1878.
Mr. R. J.
Banks.

Dalkey to Dalkey, and have a man struck to pay them, and in the same way with Kingstown and Blackrock, and then to have the sanitary expense paid out of another rate, and that in future all the debt would be thrown over the entire amalgamated township.

153. Mr. Kelly.—That would be the only way it could be done, but how would the representation be?

153. CHAIRMAN.—The next question would be as to your view of the number of the governing body necessary to carry on the work of the three townships. You have at present twenty-one members here, and there are fifty-seven altogether in the three townships!—We would want thirty here, because there are a number of committees.

154. But suppose the quorum was reduced!—Our quorum is five, I believe, and we very seldom separate without having a meeting. We have a large number of committees which do much work independent of the general Board. But I would say that the wards in the new township should get representation according to the valuation and population, but I would not alter the number of wards. There are four wards in Kingstown, one in Dalkey, and three in Blackrock, that is eight altogether, and three Commissioners for each one would be twenty-four, and twenty-four would just be as good as thirty.

155. Mr. Parkinson.—Mr. Botham has put me in mind of a great inconvenience that would be caused by amalgamation. The Commissioners attending the Board from the Booterstown and Dalkey ends would be at a great loss of time, and I am afraid we would not be able to get them to attend.

156. CHAIRMAN.—You can get gentlemen in London to attend distances of ten miles.

157. Captain Botham.—It would take half an hour to come from some parts of the district to the place of meeting in Kingstown, and half an hour to get back. I could not possibly give that time to travelling and afford the same reparation to the work.

158. Mr. Roche, T.D., Kingstown.—We sometimes find it very hard to get a quorum here, and if we have Dalkey and Blackrock added we would find it harder still.

159. Mr. Kelly.—I am not to be taken at present as giving evidence for the amalgamation of the three townships.

160. CHAIRMAN.—But I asked you would you be willing to take the other townships if we recommended it, and I understand you to say you would?—No.

161. But supposing we decided in favour of amalgamation!—Perhaps it would add new energy to the Board, but the township Commissioners have unanimously asked that there should be no alteration.

162. Mr. Roche.—I am in favour of leaving each Board a jurisdiction for the present, and I believe all the members of the Board are of the same opinion.

163. Mr. Hayes.—We passed a resolution that we did not deem it expedient at present to tender evidence as a Board, but we left it open to individual members to give their opinion.

164. Mr. T. M. Power, Town Clerk, Blackrock.—I have just had a letter from Mr. Wigham, our chairman, and he desires me to say that, at a subsequent meeting of his Board, there was a minute made that it was the unanimous opinion of the Blackrock Commissioners that they are not all anxious for amalgamation with Kingstown and Dalkey, and that it would be quite injurious to be so amalgamated in the interests of the three townships, and the Commissioners will send you a minute to that effect.

165. Captain Botham.—And you have the opinion of the Blackrock and Dalkey people that the attendance here would not be the same here as in Blackrock and Dalkey, and that the overseeing of the township would be lost to a great extent by the time occupied in getting here.

166. Mr. Kelly.—I don't give evidence as to amalgamation, but if such a thing takes place I stated the

ground on which I think it is fair it should be done, and I think we should get an opportunity of weighing the question, whether it would be advantageous to us or otherwise.

167. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing we suggested a body of twenty-four Commissioners, do you see any reason why they should not efficiently carry on the affairs of the township?—No, they could carry it on better than 37.

168. Do you think it would be an advantage, taking a large and comprehensive view of the matter, to have these three townships amalgamated, to have one governing body instead of three, one set of officers instead of three, and have the benefit of a united administration, with a fire brigade, and a uniform system of drainage, paying officers proper salaries instead of paying three sets improper salaries, as they must necessarily be?—I think the saving would be very little in that way, and the supervision, as divided now, is a great deal better, but, at the same time, as far as amalgamation is concerned, I would insist that the townships of Killiney and Ballybreck should be brought in here also. I should like that a day should be allowed to the gentlemen to say what they would do under the circumstances, and I would ask an opportunity of discussing with our Board whether they would go in for amalgamation.

169. What would you say as to there being a Metropolitan Board, each district remaining as it is?—Don't mention it at all.

170. Can you suggest any reason why it should not be in Dublin as it is in London, where there is a Metropolitan Board to carry on metropolitan improvements?—No improvements that would take place in the city would benefit Kingstown at all, and why should we pay for it.

171. Then I might say no improvements in the heart of London would benefit the people of Woolwich!—They are different places altogether.

172. At Blackrock they said that to some metropolitan improvements they ought to pay some contribution, and some gentlemen stated they would be prepared to pay something towards the city instead of being amalgamated with the city.

173. Mr. Kelly.—I think it would be the greatest injustice so far as Kingstown is concerned that they should be asked to pay for improvements in Dublin, and the reason is that Kingstown is seven miles from Dublin, and that it is a township within itself, and that it has no desire to interfere with the Municipal Corporation of Dublin.

174. CHAIRMAN.—But no one can shut his eyes to the fact that the streets of Dublin are largely used every day by numbers of mercantile men and their families, coming in from this district, and as it is a great advantage to them that Dublin should be as healthy as possible, should they not contribute something towards it?—The answer to that is that Kingstown is a watering place. We are most anxious to have it well served, and we are going to spend thousands on outfall sewer, and make it as attractive as possible, and it behoves the people of Dublin to make Dublin as attractive as possible so that people won't come out here to live.

175. Mr. Grace.—The merchants of Dublin use our roads in sending out their goods from the city, and they don't pay anything.

176. Mr. Foley.—All these merchants who live in Kingstown pay house rent in Dublin.

177. Mr. Barff.—The argument about the metropolitan improvements might apply to the whole country!

178. CHAIRMAN.—But you must stop somewhere, and the only place to stop is at the end of suburban rural districts.

179. Mr. Parkinson.—My reasons for opposing amalgamation are chiefly as to taxation. I believe that within thirty years our taxation in Dalkey will

Kingsdown
Sept. 14, 1878
Mr. R. A.
Russ,

be reduced to £r. 6d. in the pound. We have gone into it very carefully since this question has cropped up, and we have no doubt our total taxation will be reduced as I say for all purposes. Our district has increased in valuation to a very great extent indeed—more so than Kingstown or Bray, at present of the number of buildings. I think there are more buildings going on in Dalkey than in Kingstown. From 1871 to 1876, the valuation has increased £1,455 £.

180. CHAIRMAN.—You will find that Kingstown has increased about £7,000.

181. Mr. Parkinson.—I should say in proportion Dalkey has increased quite as much. Even within the last two or three years it has increased greatly, and if we go on increasing as we have done—as we have no doubt we will, for we have become a favourite place, especially there are four doctors building houses, and seven doctors there altogether at present—we are likely to become a very thriving place. We have borrowed almost all that we intend to borrow, for all our works are done, our drainage will be finished in another year, and everything necessary will be completed. Kingstown and Blackrock are only consuming their drainage, and they are only commencing to borrow. If amalgamation took place to-morrow, and that Kingstown borrowed £50,000 for the improvement of Kingstown, it would be levied over the whole of Dalkey and Blackrock.

182. CHAIRMAN.—In five years the valuation of Kingstown has gone up £10,000.

183. Mr. Crean, T.C., Blackrock.—The valuation of our district has gone up £12,000 in the same period.

184. Mr. Parkinson.—I think in proportion ours is higher. Another objection we have to amalgamation is that if we wanted to carry out some local improvement, we would find ourselves in the minority in the Kingstown Board, and my evidence on behalf of Dalkey is that we have unanimously resolved to protect against amalgamation for that very reason. Our improvement we have in view is providing a people's park, and place of recreation, as we have a right to do under the Act of Parliament, and levy a rate for the purpose, but if we amalgamated with Kingstown we would be outvoted on that question. It is in the nature of things. I think it would be a monstrous hardship to deprive us of that privilege, and we also propose to erect a public library.

185. There is a proposal before the Dalkey Commissioners for that purpose, and it will be a great acquisition to the township. It is not a sentimental question, we would be simply outvoted here. It is proposed to have twenty-four Commissioners to govern this large district of seven miles, and Dalkey could not expect more than three, and where would three be against the remainder of that Board.

186. CHAIRMAN.—The suggestion was to give each place representation according to population and valuation.

187. Captain Boleyn.—Even according to population and valuation it would give three or four only.

188. Mr. Parkinson.—At all events it would not be five out of the twenty-four, and if we proposed those improvements, the Commissioners of Kingstown, without acting dishonestly, would say, no, that they would like to keep the centre of attraction in Kingstown, and therefore I say we would be lost by the centralization scheme, and as I say our rates will soon be reduced to £r. 6d., but with this amalgamation they would be kept up to 2s. or 2s. 6d. At present we pay 3s. 10d.

189. Mr. Annie, Town Clerk, Kingstown.—Our rates are 3s. at present, and the same argument would apply to us, for we would be reducing our debt also.

190. CHAIRMAN.—Do you mean to say that you would be able to keep your roads and have water and all for £r. 6d. I—We do, and another reason is that if you reduce the number of Commissioners, you will lose that local supervision which is very valuable.

191. CHAIRMAN.—What is your opinion of the percentage of the population of Dalkey of professional men, and merchants coming into Dublin every day, and earning their bread there?—The per centage is not very large except in summer. For two months in summer there would be a considerable per centage. The per centage is small of professional men. It has been said there are twenty-five per cent of professional men in Dalkey, but I am the only one of my profession who lives in Dalkey, and practise in Dublin.

192. Mr. John McEvoy, T.C.—I am going to give evidence as an individual. I have had twelve years' experience of the affairs of Kingstown township. I have been a Commissioner for eight years, and Chairman of the Board for two years. If the question was ours, pure and simple, of extending the boundary of Kingstown, so as to include Dalkey and Blackrock, I would be totally against it, but if it is only part of a whole scheme, embracing within it a very different sort of executive for the management of affairs from what we have heard mentioned, namely, instead of the small Committee, a paid executive responsible to a representative body of Commissioners, the one to stand towards the other in something like the position of the Government to the House of Commons, that, I believe, is the only form of carrying on Local Government well. There should also be a more equitable system of taxation, with representation of owners and all other interests. The union of townships, by itself, is a measure which would be of little practical benefit, and without the consent of all interested should not be carried out. What is the present state of things in the four townships of Dalkey, Kingstown, Killiney, and Blackrock? These are four Boards of Commissioners, with in all sixty-two Commissioners for a population of nearly 30,000. Dublin, similarly provided for, should have 600 instead of sixty Councillors. The affairs of Killiney are for the greater part administered by the Board of Guardians, a more economical plan, as is shown by the lower rate of taxation and debt, as compared with the neighbouring township of Dalkey, the Dalkey rates being 2s. Id. for what is done by the Guardians in Killiney for 2s. 9d. The Dalkey debt is £7,341, about 12s. in the pound on the rateable portion of the township. The Killiney debt is only £2,800, or 2s. 9d. in the pound on the valuation. The three townships of Kingstown, Blackrock, and Dalkey, have each their secretary, their town surveyor, their solicitor or "law agent," as so described in "Thom's," their consulting sanitary officer or superintendent medical officer of health, their executive sanitary officer, their medical officers of health, their sub-sanitary officers, their rates collector, water inspector, head gauge, yard clock, and junior officials. The Acts of Parliament they are supposed to administer, or assist in administering, are numerous and formidable in their proportions. To begin with the Town Improvement and Public Health Acts, the latter with its 203 clauses, embracing duties to be discharged, requiring skill and competence of no ordinary character. In addition, there are among other Acts the Bath and Washhouses Act, Food Adulteration Act, Public Libraries Act, Bakerhouse Regulation Act, Common Lodging house Act, Markets and Fairs Act, Sale of Gas Act, Explosive Substances Act, Infant Life Protection Act, Dogs Act, the Artizans Dwellings Act. To carry out well and efficiently all these Acts in each of the townships would need the imposition of an enormous amount of taxation, to pay the salaries of skilled and competent officers. This could not be done, and they have only a make-believe system, a Local Government on paper only. They have a number of gentlemen who for small salaries beginning so low as £10, are willing to allow themselves to be called by high sounding titles, and profess to discharge the duties of the office connected with these titles. The result is, that in some instances these duties are not discharged at all, in others in a perfunctory manner, and apparently when

KINGSTOWN

Sept 15, 1872.

Mr. R. J.
Ensl.

the officials have nothing else to occupy them. On the whole they leave their local government and town improvement carried on without economy or efficiency. The Acts of Parliament not carried out include the Sale of Gas Act, 1859, by which the local authority is to appoint an inspector of meters to test and stamp meters. The gasworks clauses amendment amounts 1871, under which the local authority is to test the illuminating power of gas, to obtain copies of Company's Acts, with the view of protecting public interests in the matter of reduction of price and dealing with capital account. The Artisans Dwellings Act cannot be put in force, all the townships being too small, but united, however, the Act could be put in operation, the population being over 25,000. The Beds and Washhouses, Free Libraries, and Dogs Acts, cannot be carried out in small townships. So closely are Blackrock, Kingstown, and the greater part of Dalkey in one natural drainage area, that all the engineers consulted on the drainage question, whether by Blackrock or by Kingstown, advised united drainage. Mr. Hassard in 1871, and Mr. Price in 1872, consulted by Blackrock, as did Mr. Hassard in 1872, and Sir J. Hawkshaw in 1873, when consulted by Kingstown, although all were informed that it was the desire of the Commissioners in both townships not to go outside their own boundaries, felt constrained to recommend a unified drainage scheme. The new Court-house will make Kingstown the proper centre for quarter sessions business. The governing body, constituted a town council, would have all the powers of town councils in towns with quarter sessions. They would appoint the fiscal assessor, inspector of weights and measures, and generally be able to deal with local questions with an authority now unknown. The best check to robbery in public bodies is publicity. It is well known that, as a rule, the smaller and more obscure the body, the greater the chance of corruption and inefficiency. At present newspaper reporters do not attend regularly the meetings of the Commissioners of the township, and for that reason the Board meet usually on the same day and at great distances between, while their proceedings are usually too unimportant to have an effort made to report them. With one Board and comparatively large business, the case would be different and fuller reports would appear. Reform in the administration should accompany amalgamation. The difficulties between Dublin and Rathmines, on account of large differences in the incidence of taxation, would not interfere in this case. I would be in favour of a uniform rate, as I consider the rate in the lowest rated district (Kingstown) sufficient with the more economical administration proposed for the entire new district. As to the water supply and the means of protection against fire, I myself in '72, being then Chairman of the Town Commissioners, consulted Captain Shaw, of the London Fire Brigade, as to the best means. It would certainly be advantageous to the township to have a well organized Fire Brigade, and the advice of Captain Shaw was, that in Kingstown, with over-small resources, to have an effective Fire Brigade, there would be certain appliances required, which he explained to me at great length, which could not be carried out effectively in a small township. That it would be necessary to have a Fire Brigade, accustomed to obey orders, and to provide such a staff would be a great burden on a small district, and he advised us to unite with the Dublin Fire Brigade, and have a small rate of one penny in the pound spread over the entire Metropolitan district, with fire stations throughout it, but that advice was not carried out, and I think that the whole Metropolitan district would gain largely by being united for such a purpose. So far from the ordinary sevengrens and road masons being an efficient Fire Brigade, Captain Shaw told me he could not even depend on trained policemen in London. He said, you must have men trained for the purpose, and accustomed to obey

certain officers. Owing to restrictions recently imposed by the Corporation on the townships, there is not a constant supply of water in any of the townships available, and I look upon that as very dangerous in case of fire. It also prevents households in elevated parts of the township having a constant supply of water in their houses, but if we had the whole of these districts united, we might make an arrangement with the Corporation in having a uniform rate. At present Blackrock pays 3d., Kingstown 5d., and the other townships 4d., and if the Corporation got a uniform rate of 3d. all round, it might be possible to make a new arrangement and relieve them of all excuse for the necessity of shutting down the valves. It would enable them to give a high pressure at all hours of the night. Kingstown is at present the lowest rated of the townships, but what it would gain by the new arrangement would apply compensation for the very small per-cent of the charge that might be put on amalgamation. I think it is a very good principle to have a uniform rate. I have already spoken of a responsible executive, separate from the representative body, and that would do away with the idea of favouritism. The executive should be a responsible office, appointed by the Local Government Board, with the sanction of the Government, to be removed with the sanction of the Government, and to be responsible to the Local Body for his acts, who would watch him and prevent his doing anything wrong—who would also receive his estimates and accounts, and keep him straight. I think there should be some plan devised by which he would be appointed conjointly, that the Board should nominate three persons, and the Lord Lieutenant select one out of them, so that they would have something to say as to his appointment, and then he should be some person whom the Government or the Local Government Board approves of.

194. Mr. Kelly.—Do you know of any such officer in Ireland?—I am speaking of a change.

195. I don't think the appointment or dismissal of the offices should be subject to the approval of the Lord Lieutenant. Does Mr. McEvoy propose to have the Corporation Fire Brigade brought out here?

Mr. McEvoy.—If united you would have nothing to do with the Corporation Fire Brigade. I think that being united we could have a Fire Brigade of our own, but being disunited I see no other way than by using the Fire Brigade of the Corporation.

196. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing the Town Commissioners were allowed to remain as they are, what is your opinion, knowing the class of people who inhabit the townships, as to the proposal to pay a rate in aid in analogy to the bridge tax?

Mr. McEvoy.—I would not go farther than the approach to the bridge.

197. Would you say then, on the principle of the Metropolitan Board in London, they should pay towards the main drainage of the Liffey?—No, I think they should provide their own drainage, and they should not be asked to contribute to the Dublin drainage.

198. Should they not contribute something towards the city in which they make their money?—No, I think their being constituted a separate urban district and their amalgamation together would make the case much stronger to be totally unconnected with the city.

199. Would you draw a distinction between these townships and Rathfarnham?—No, I don't think that Rathdown or Pembroke should contribute anything towards the maintenance of the streets of Dublin, but I would make them pay for the approaches to the bridge.

200. What do you call the approach to it?—They want a new street from Brunswick-street, and the people of Pembroke township are more interested in that than the people of James's-street or Thomas-street, even the people of Blackrock and Kingstown are more interested, and as the principle is established that the bridge should be charged on the Metropolitan district, I think the necessary approaches might be charged also.

201. Would you go so far as to say that the keeping up of Westmoreland-street and Sackville-street should be constituted towards by the township?—No.

202. Do you see any difference in dealing with Dublin as the Metropolis of Ireland, and the London Metropolitan district, and make every one contribute towards improvements in the heart of that area?—If the same state of things existed in Dublin as in London, where the population of London proper is only 70,000, I would do the same thing. They neglected to deal with the Corporation of London as they should have done at the time of the Corporation reform, and then when it was wanted to have some improvements carried out it was necessary to create a new Board.

203. Mr. James R. Stanley, D.L.—I speak not so much as a Commissioner as the representative of two noblemen who might be supposed to have some sympathy with the views that have been expressed. They both agree in the strongest possible manner in wishing to keep away from the city of Dublin. With respect to the union of these districts they are perfectly satisfied with the present state of things. They would prefer to leave it left to the present Boards to decide themselves.

204. CHAIRMAN.—Don't you think that the three townships would be better managed under one Board with one staff of officers?—For myself I speak entirely. I should not be the least afraid that after a few years we would entirely forget our differences, and it would not be "I am for Blackrock," "I am for Kingstown," and so on; but they would be there as a Board representing the affairs of the whole district, and I would not be the least afraid of the extended district. It would not be too large. It would contain about 30,000 inhabitants. It would have control over a considerable income for ever at a moderate rate. The valuation of the extended property would be about £130,000, and that would yield a very satisfactory income. At the same time I am perfectly satisfied to let things remain as they are, but I would see no difficulty in the change. It would not be at all an unwieldy or unmanageable district. There might be some difficulty at first, but it would melt away.

205. What would be your view individually as to the debts?—I have never gone into them, but I don't think there would be any great difficulty. If the debts were to remain, the debts of each locality, it would be very simple to apportion them so, or if the difference was found not to be very serious it would be more satisfactory to merge them all together. If they were serious it would be only fair to leave them separate.

206. Would you think twenty-four Commissioners sufficient?—Yes.

207. Would you leave the wards as they are?—I think they would fall into their places. To give representation in proportion to valuation and rating would be fair, I think. As to the fire-brigade, I think the townships should be united together, and even if not united, I think they are extensive enough to keep up a fire-brigade.

208. Mr. Foley.—Do you think a stipendiary Commissioner would be desirable to see that the resolutions of the Board were properly carried out?—I don't go in for that. I think a Board constituted as we are would have power enough in themselves.

209. Mr. M'Evoy.—There should be a line drawn between the executive and the representative body. The representative body should not enter into details, and the executive body should do that.

210. Mr. F. R. Stanley, Solicitor.—I appeal for Lord Carysfort with respect to the proposed amalgamation with Dublin.

211. CHAIRMAN.—No one suggested amalgamation with Dublin.

212. Mr. Stanley.—No, but it is suggested that certain charges for Dublin works should be made on the townships, and I would oppose anything of the

kind. I think the present boundaries are very inconvenient between Kingstown and Dalkey.

213. As representing Lord Carysfort, do you think it would be more desirable to have the three townships formed into one with Kingstown at its head?—That is a thing I don't care particularly about, but Castlparke road is at present the boundary between Kingstown and Dalkey, and there are certain inconveniences about the supply of water, and gas, and scavenging, which might be remedied by having the boundary either of one electoral division or the townships amalgamated. At present the half of that road is looked after by one township, and half by the other.

214. Mr. Foley.—I think the evidence in favour of the amalgamation of the three townships only comes to be a question of the terms upon which it is to take place. I am one of the Commissioners here.

215. CHAIRMAN.—Would you put the debts of each district on that district?

Mr. Stanley.—I think Mr. M'Evoy put it so clearly that it would amount to so little that it would not be on injustice to anyone.

216. Are you in favour of starting at once with the consolidated rate, and consolidated debt?—Yes; the other townships would derive the advantages of our new Town Hall and so on. I don't quite go with you as to the contribution to Dublin. The mere fact of our sending in professional men by a certain train is an argument that might be addressed the other way. In Dublin I very seldom cross the water or use the bridges, and I don't think we should be put in the position of being obliged to pay a bridge rate at all. I think there is reciprocity in that respect by Dublin sending out sick people here.

217. Would you think twenty-four or thirty Commissioners sufficient to manage the amalgamated township?—I would prefer thirty, which would give a larger representation. I think there is a great advantage in having a local eye on the included district; but my opinion as to the number of Commissioners would be quite overruled by your own judgment on the matter.

218. Would you have each district represented according to valuation and population?—I think so. I may say that when I came to deal with the Blackrock gentlemen about these conflicting interests, and the powers, I found rational men so easy to deal with, that I believe there would be no difficulty in having one Board to deal with the whole district.

219. Do you see any difficulty in leaving the bounds of the existing wards standing as they are?

Mr. Kelly.—It was an engineer and lawyer, with the sanction of the Lord Lieutenant, who made the wards in Kingstown, and probably they had very good reason for making them as they are, and I am quite sure that the Blackrock and Dalkey gentlemen are satisfied with their wards.

220. CHAIRMAN.—Would it be unfair to give Dalkey four even though they have only the one ward?—Yes, give Blackrock nine Commissioners, according to its valuation, Kingstown would be entitled to seventeen, and give Dalkey the remainder, making thirty in all.

221. Mr. F. M. Crouse.—We are unanimous in Blackrock that we are better off as we are. We have come to terms now, except as to the drainage question, which only affects the two townships. Every Commissioner has his eye on his own district. We have our roads in very fair order, and we are getting on in the way of footpaths, and everything else. We are adding to the comforts of the place and its sanitary arrangements also. We have improved the back slums of Blackrock to an extent that no one could have any idea of. At the time I knew Blackrock first it was a perfect slum, and now the streets are all well cleaned. They are not perfect, but every day we are adding to the improvements.

222. CHAIRMAN.—You have heard the recommendation of the select committee of the House of Commons. Can you tell me any conceivable reason why we should

KINGSTOWN
Sept. 18, 1879.
Mr. H. J.
Stanley.

Kingsway
Sept. 1st, 1879.
Mr. E. J.
Barrett

report that these townships should remain separate!—We were a township before Kingstown was formed at all.

Mr. Barrett

Mr. BARRETT, Engineer, Backrock township, examined.

224. CHAIRMAN.—Is the portion which Mr. Kelly proposes to take away the most valuable part of the township?—It is.

225. Generally speaking, is it the least expensive to keep up?—Yes.

226. And would taking away that part increase the rates in the township?—Yes.

227. The staff must remain the same?—Yes.

228. How much would the alteration take away?—It would take away rating of £10,000, which at 2s. would be £1,000 a year.

229. What does it cost to keep up the roads in that district?—About £200 a year.

230. The most valuable portion of your township is in the Kingstown Electoral Division?—I know we are unanimous in wishing to remain as we are.

BLACKROCK
Sept. 1, 1879.

Mr. P. M.
Porter

BLACKROCK.—SEPTEMBER 2nd, 1879.

Before Mr. W. A. EXHAN, q.c.

Mr. P. M. PORTER, examined.

1. You are Town Clerk?—Yes.

2. What is the area of the township?—1,071 acres; and is divided into three wards, Blackrock, Monkstown, and Bootestown. Blackrock contains 436a 3s. 3d.; Monkstown, 266a. On 1r., Bootestown, 420a. In. 16r. making altogether 1,063a. In. 16r. By last year's measurement it was 1,071 acres, but this is the return as returned by us to the Valuation Office, 1,063a. In. 16r.

3. What is the valuation of each ward?—For 1879 and 1880 Blackrock is £18,443 10s.; Monkstown, £17,134 1s.; Bootestown, £12,459 40s.

4. That is £48,977 5s. altogether?—Yes.

5. Is not that less than it was last year?—No, for there is the gas company £304 and the waterworks too for the Corporation and our own.

6. That is on buildings and land alone?—Yes.

7. What is the valuation of the means?—For the Corporation £119 1s. and Blackrock £863.

8. How many Commissioners are returned for each of the wards?—Nine for Blackrock, nine for Monkstown, and six for Bootestown;—twenty-four altogether.

9. Are the rated occupiers in each ward about the same?—They are not.

10. Are the ratepayers equally represented in the three wards in numbers?—Yes fairly.

11. Is there about the same number of ratepayers in Blackrock and Monkstown wards and a less number in Bootestown?—Yes.

12. Is it desirable to the Commissioners that there should be any change in the wards?—I think not.

13. Suppose everything remains as it is, is there any change in the wards wanted?—No, I think not.

14. Are the municipal wards coterminous with the Poor Law wards?—We have no Poor Law wards.

15. In how many Electoral Divisions is the township situated?—Three, Blackrock, Stillorgan, and Monkstown.

16. Is not part of Monkstown in Kingstown township also?—Yes.

17. How is the Monkstown portion of your township separated from the other?—By a road at the end of Longford Avenue.

18. It is all in the Rathdown Union?—Yes.

19. Kingstown and Dalkey are also in the Rathdown Union?—Yes.

20. What was the date of your Act?—1863.

21. What is your maximum rate under that Act?—2s. for improvement and 1s. for water.

230. Then it would be taking about £1,300 from the rest of the township?—Yes.

231. Captain Bokes.—It would be a loss of about £900 on the township. How much would that represent?

Mr. BARRETT.—About fivepence in the pound, and it would be most injurious to us.

232. Captain Bokes.—Do you think the rates would be increased 5d. by the amalgamation with Kingstown?—I think so. We are against both amalgamation and the extension of Kingstown.

The inquiry then terminated.

23. Of course the Commissioners are entitled to sanitary rate?—Yes, the rates leviable without extraordinary powers are 2s. for improvement and 5d. for water. They are increaseable to 2s. 4d. and 1s. on calling a meeting by two-thirds of the ratepayers.

24. How did you impose a 2s. rate in 1874?—There was a people's park and the sanitary rate included in that.

24. What were your entire rates including the people's park and sanitary rate, and also the poor rate in and since the year 1874?—The poor rate is different in the three electoral divisions.

It was as follows:—

	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.
	s. d.				
Blackrock.	4 11	4 10	0 8	0 10	1 3
Kingstown.	1 1	1 0	0 11	0 10	1 2
Stillorgan.	4 10	4 11	0 9	0 9	1 0

The county at large charges for the same period were:—

	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.
	s. d.				
	0 7	0 7	0 7	0 7	0 14

The other rates were:—

	Improvement rate.	Special lighting fund rate.	Water suply rate.	Sanitary rate.	People's Park rate.
	s. d.	d.	s. d.	s. d.	d.
1874.	3 0	7	5	0	0
1875.	2 0	6	6	0	0
1876.	2 0	2	6	6	0
1877.	1 10	6	6	2	0
1878.	2 0	8	4	4	2
1879.	2 0	8	6	0	3

25. Had you not a sanitary rate in 1874?—No.

26. Was not any money expended for sanitary purposes?—We were not a Sanitary Board then.

27. But you became a Sanitary Board in 1874 at all events?—We did not strike a rate for it; it was in November, 1874 we were created a Sanitary Board.

28. The striking fund in 1874 was 7d. and next year it was only 6d.?—Yes.

29. How was that?—Because money was paid off and there was a surplus.

30. How could the striking fund be only 3d. in 1876, when it was 6d. the year before?—Because there was a surplus remaining in our books, we levied too much in the previous years and therefore it was less in after years.

31. Did you do anything for the people's park in 1877?—We did not strike any rate for it.

32. Is there any sanitary rate for 1879?—No, it is struck now as part of the Township Improvement Rate.

BLACKBROOK
Sept 3, 1873.
Mr. P. M.
Foster.

33. But each year with the exception of one, you struck 2s for improvement rate without going into sanitary improvements at all and then in point of fact if you take 1s. for sanitary rate you only keep 1s. 8d. for the improvement of the township!—That is so.

34. In 1878 your rates were 3s. 6d. 1—Yes.

35. Then the way the rates stood for the last five years was 3s., 3s., 3s., then 3s. 6d., and then 3s. 2d. 1—Yes.

36. What is the maximum rate for the peoples' park!—3s.

37. What are your debts!—Our powers under the Act of 1865 were £20,000.

38. Was that to be repaid by sinking fund!—Yes.

39. Of one-thirtieth!—Yes.

40. How much of that did you borrow!—That was on the improvement rate and water; £16,500 was borrowed altogether.

41. How much of that have you paid off!—£5,000.

42. Have you kept up the sinking fund regularly!—Yes.

43. What other debts do you owe!—We borrowed £4,500 for public works under a separate Act.

44. What was the date of that!—32 and 33 Victoria, chap. 38.

45. Have you a sinking fund for that also!—We added it to the other fund.

46. Is that all you borrowed!—Yes.

47. And you now owe £11,500 of the first sum!—Yes.

48. And how much on the peoples' park!—About £4,500, that is altogether £16,000.

49. Then you have not reduced any of that!—No; but the debt of the Town Hall has been reduced. The peoples' park debt was only borrowed recently, some of it in the last year.

50. In 1874 you borrowed some of it!—We have borrowed on mortgages, and we could not do that except in certain proportions.

51. Then you should have made provision in the sinking fund for the peoples' park debt as well as the other!—Yes; we have invested it for that purpose.

52. And re-invested the interest!—Yes.

53. How many miles of road are there in the township!—Sixteen, that includes lanes and alleys.

54. Does that include the main road!—No; it excludes the Rock Road.

55. Do you pay one-third to keep it up!—No; we pay in proportion to our valuation.

56. What is the salary of the Town Clerk!—£250, including sanitary fees.

57. But our Town Clerk!—£200.

58. You have a Town Surveyor!—Yes; Mr. Barnes, at £230.

59. What other officers have you connected with the township!—The collector gets a poundage, and there is a yard clerk or weigh clerk and storekeeper, at £1 5s. a week.

60. I don't suppose Mr. Barnes gives you all his time for that!—He gives a good deal of it.

61. How is the repairing of the roads done!—By ourselves.

62. Have you a staff of workmen for the purpose!—We have a staff of workmen, and we contract for the horse labour.

63. What do you pay for the horses!—6s. for each horse, cart, and harness.

64. What do the roads cost, including scavenging and everything!—Something under £1,100 a year.

65. How much would that be on the valuation!—6d. in the pound.

66. How much annually have you laid out on asphalt!—That includes everything except asphaltic, graveling and everything.

67. What staff have you for scavenging!—We have nominally ten men. Some of them are occasionally with the water inspector, and one man on sanitary business; but the actual staff is nine men.

68. Are the horses employed by contract for that!—Yes; six.

69. How often are the roads scavenged!—We keep a sweeping machine, and we generally use that in wet weather; and when it is rather stiff we use brushes and shovels.

70. But one machine would not do sixteen miles of road!—We only do the main roads, the bye-roads don't require it so much.

71. What is your sanitary staff!—I am Executive Sanitary Officer, with £30 a year salary.

72. What staff have you!—A sanitary Sub-officer and a Medical Officer of Health.

73. What does the Sub-sanitary Officer get!—£1 15s. a week.

74. Have you only one man for the entire district!—Yes.

75. Is he partly paid by the Local Government Board!—Yes.

76. Surely one man is not able to inspect the whole district and look after it!—Yes; we find him quite sufficient.

77. Have you a large poor population!—Yes; in the immediate vicinity of the road we have.

78. Have you many of the artizans class!—Not many.

79. Is the work in the township done mostly by workmen from Dublin!—Yes; and some from the township.

80. Have you got the sanitary officer's book and your own here!—Yes.

81. Are there any complaints in it at all!—I have not had any.

82. Have you a pauper population!—Not many.

83. Are the houses connected with the main sewers!—To my knowledge they are.

84. Has there been an inspection to see whether they are or not!—There has.

85. Would you say there are no houses that are not connected!—I would not say that, because there are some people who have not complied with our notice.

86. What have you been doing since 1866!—There were old sewers with which some of the houses were connected, and the Sanitary Committee thought it a hardship to make people take up their old sewers and drain into the new ones.

87. Are the old sewers unconnected with your system of drainage!—These were old sewers which worked very well for those they suited, but those who desired separation were connected with the new main drainage. Substantially the law is carried out as to the drainage.

88. Do you say the mains are all properly attended to!—I believe they are.

89. Is there a water supply for flushing in them all!—There is a fountain in every court way.

90. Have you any public hospital in the township!—No.

91. What is done with the sick poor!—They go to Rathdown and some of them to Kingstown and some to Dublin.

92. Have you any mortuary or disinfecting apparatus in the township!—No.

93. Don't you know that you are bound to have them under the Public Health Act!—We use disinfectants; we send to Rathdown Union to get the use of their appliances.

94. Do they give you a conveyance!—Yes.

95. But you are bound to have all these things in the township, if you choose to be a township. Do you compel the people to go to hospital!—Yes; the medical officer gives his certificate and he removes them to Rathdown.

96. Is the Varity water through the whole of the township!—Yes.

97. What is your contract!—Twenty gallons per head per day.

98. At how much!—3½d.

99. Is the water always on!—Sometimes we take the pressure off at night.

100. Is it a fact that it is turned off entirely at night!—No.

BLACKBROOK
Sept. 3, 1871.

Mr. F. M.
Porter.

101. Is it turned off to the extent that it won't go to the people's houses?—It is turned off at the foot of Beoternsway Avenue, but the great main is always charged.

102. Are there houses that have no water at night?—There are a few of the highest houses that have no water at night.

103. Take Alma Road, have they water there?—They must, unless there is something wrong with their own works.

104. Is there any portion of the township shut off at night?—No, there is no part shut off more than another.

105. Mr. Kelly, T.C.—We have heard no complaints.

106. CHAIRMAN.—I have heard complaints.

107. Captain Bitham, T.C.—It must have been from Alma Road where it is due to their own bad water works.

108. Mr. Kelly, T.C.—No complaints have been made to the Board.

109. CHAIRMAN.—I see that the Commissioners consider it desirable to extend the boundaries, but they are not unanimous in that!

Captain Bitham.—Although we were not unanimous, a large majority of the Commissioners are in favor of it.

Examination of Mr. PORTER resumed.

110. Is there a large suburban population immediately outside your boundary, for instance up at Bellangan Park, Obelisk Park, and Newtown Park, and do not these gentlemen derive immense advantages from your township?—There are, and I should say they do.

111. Don't you light them up to the very boundary?—Presently.

112. Do you light the entire of the town?—Yes.

113. To the extreme boundary?—Yes.

114. Have you water pipes laid to the extreme boundary?—Yes.

115. Then as far as lighting is concerned they enjoy the benefit of it in going to and from their places?—They do.

116. Do you consider that they should pay some thing for these advantages?—Decidedly.

117. Would you propose they should contribute something towards keeping up the roads of the township, and the lighting as well as the watering of the roads and scavenging, or that they should be brought

into the township?—I think it would be very well if we could get them to contribute, they enjoy all these benefits from us.

118. Captain Bitham.—They pay for their own roads at present £1 8d. in the pound, and they would have to pay £3. in the township.

119. CHAIRMAN.—Are there any complaints about the keeping up of the roads?

Mr. Porter.—No.

120. CHAIRMAN.—Or as to the scavenging or such things?—No, except that the Commissioners may call the attention of the surveyor to things that may not be done to the manure, but they are eventually done.

121. Have there been any formal complaints made?—No.

122. Is there any district occupied by farms round the township, or least principally occupied with gentlemen's seats?—There is a great deal of arable land.

123. Does that land pay considerably more rent to the landlord, and, if so, is that caused by its proximity to the township as a market?—It is.

Mr. J. R. Wigham, examined.

124. You are Chairman of the Township Commissioners?—Yes.

125. Are you satisfied with the sanitary condition of the town?—I am.

126. And as far as you know are there more than the ordinary complaints from time to time with respect to nuisances?—There are not.

127. Are you satisfied with the condition in which the roads are kept up, and the scavenging and cleaning?—On the whole, I am. When complaints are made we take steps immediately to remedy them.

128. You must be very fortunate if you are able to keep up your roads at £6 on the valuation, because it is very much more in Penbroke and in Rathmines, and in Penge they say they are not able to keep up their roads as they wish.

129. Mr. Bitham, Township Surveyor.—I can perfectly understand that both Rathmines and Penbroke lie along a flat, and hold a good deal more water than our roads.

130. CHAIRMAN.—As far as you know are there any substantial complaints made about the roads in the township?

Mr. Wigham.—There are not, because although we have occasion to find fault sometimes we have it so completely under our control that no necessity for complaint can really exist. We have a committee whose duty it is to go round the places, and if we see anything requiring to be done we get it done at once.

131. How are you off for drainage in the township?—As to main drainage we are very badly off in one respect.

132. Without the help of Dublin or Penbroke, or making some arrangement with Kingstown, have you any means of drainage?—We have abundant means of drainage. We drain at present into the sea, and our

shore is peculiarly well suited for that, because the sea cliff is all along. The land is high, and we have a fine fall into the sea all along the foreshore.

133. That is you discharge the sewage on the foreshore all along?—Yes. I don't say we are satisfied with that.

134. You may be thankful you have not some litigious person to stop you?—There is no nuisance from it.

135. Am I not right in saying you cannot perfectly discharge your nuisance on the foreshore without coming to an arrangement either with your neighbour on the west or your neighbour on the east?—That is quite true, and we have made an arrangement.

136. Captain Bitham.—We can make a sewer cut into deep water which was at one time contemplated?

Mr. Wigham.—That we can do, but seeing that our neighbours are making use of the East Pier, we have made arrangements to join them in that scheme.

137. Have you actually made an arrangement?—It is not completed in all its details, it is drafted, but not approved of.

138. Mr. Kelly.—We have made steps in this direction, but we have not actually signed or sealed the agreement, and the carrying out of the arrangement is only interfered with by the Kingstown Railway Company, who claim £5,000 for the right of crossing their line, or a sum of £100 a year, and we say to the Company—"This is a great public improvement to be carried out in the public interest, and whatever your statutable rights are, we are prepared to pay you, but we are not bound to pay you for right of way or anything else", and we proposed the appointment of an arbitrator.

139. CHAIRMAN.—Have you got the sanction of the Local Government Board?

Mr. Kelly.—They say to us "Get your agreement, and then we will consider it".

140. Mr. Wigham.—Not a particle of sewage would be cast on the forebare. The Pembroke people are doing the same, and that would clear the forebare from Dublin to Kingstown.

141. CHAIRMAN.—There was a scheme prepared by Mr. Hassell.

142. Captain Bethune.—It was considered so expensive it was given up.

143. CHAIRMAN.—Were there not proposals made some years ago by Kingstown to have a joint engineer appointed?

Mr. Wigham.—No, I think it was before my time. Since my time we have had nothing but the most harmonious action with them. Unfortunately we had a law suit some years ago about a discharge of a stream into that township, but that was settled, and we came to an amicable arrangement to co-operate in the scheme which Mr. Kelly has mentioned.

144. CHAIRMAN.—Was there not a proposal in 1873 from Kingstown, that an engineer should be selected from Dalkey, Kingstown, and Blackrock, with a view to entering into one common system of drainage?

Mr. Kelly.—There was a Bill brought into Parliament which we successfully resisted, on the simple ground that they did not take the steps required to get the sanction for their own Bill, and that cost us £700, although it was one of the most monstrous things ever attempted.

145. CHAIRMAN.—Have you considered the question of bringing in all the outlying districts?

Mr. Wigham.—Yes, the plans are marked on the map in green. At present I approve of bringing them in, it would be for the good of the people there, and our good, but the Board are not unanimous on the subject.

146. On what ground was it opposed?—Some considered that the district would not pay sufficient taxation, that there are not houses enough on it to repay us for the expenses of the roads and other work we would be compelled to do.

147. They are at present paying £a. 10*m*, and the county at large charges would be as much as *y* more, but even supposing it was the same that would leave £a. 4*d*. for the roads and you say that your own roads are only costing 4*d*.!—But there are other things they should get. If we include the district in the township, my opinion is we should give them all the advantages of the township.

148. Mr. Kelly.—A large proportion of the people in the district proposed to be included are in favour of being included.

149. Mr. Wigham.—As soon as we got your notice calling attention to this particular subject, our Secretary very properly summoned our Board together. Of course you mentioned in your notice that it was desirable for the Commissioners of Blackrock to have their attention called to it. The first thing that naturally suggested itself to our minds was, who has made this proposal and what are the advantages which are likely to accrue to us by this amalgamation, and no one could tell us anything about it. We saw in the newspapers there had been discussions on the subject, and we came to consider it from our own point of view to see if there were any advantages which could arise to us from the amalgamation proposed between Kingstown, Dalkey, and ourselves, and I was directed to inform you, when you came here to-day, that it was not only our own judgment as Commissioners, but as far as we could learn the opinion of the ratepayers, from questions we have asked them in our perambulations, that such an amalgamation would be very detrimental to us, and we are not able to see any advantages we would gain. We were told in a rough way we would save expense by having one Secretary, and one engineer, and a certain staff of officers, instead of three staffs in three townships, and that at first seemed very reasonable, but on looking it more closely we believed that though

there might be one district in his charge, it would be so large that his salary should be largely increased, and that he would require assistants with such high salaries also that there would be no saving; and as regards a Secretary, or Town Clerk, it would not be large saving, although there would be a little benefit in a monetary point of view. The same occurred to us as to the engineering and mechanical management of the township, and although there might be a little, there would not be more than a little saving, while we would lose far more by having such an extended district to look after, for we could not give that personal attention that the members of the different Boards now give.

At all events, speaking for the people of our Board, we give personal attention to the district over which we have authority. I live in the centre of it, which is not a very large district. A Commissioner lives here, and there, and everywhere, and they keep their eye on the roads in a way it would be impossible for them to do if the district was greatly extended. Of course in large cities you cannot help it, you must take things as you find them, you appoint districts for men to look after, and you try to keep them at it, and with what success that system is intended in Dublin everybody knows. Dublin is not a model in the way of its arrangements, and we in this township are reducing our rates, and as you find from the figures given, we are in a very comfortable position, we are harmonious externally and internally, and we are on the best terms with our neighbours, and have just concluded arrangements with the Kingstown Commissioners which will add greatly to our mutual advantage, with regard to this great work for cleansing the whole of our forebare, so that we can gain nothing in that respect by being amalgamated with Kingstown.

We are, in fact, working as two Boards, and at no greater expense than if we were one. For the work, which it is said we should be called for the purpose of doing, we have new sanitary laws which we know provide for all separate interests being subordinate to the public good, and if one local authority or township is inclined to be obstructive the law is so clear, and especially the management of the Sanitary Act so good that any obstruction can be overruled, and whether the Boards are willing or not the public good can be secured. While we have had no engagements before us except those with which you have favoured us to-day, we are not exactly prepared either to conform to this proposal or the reverse, but so far as we know, we do not advocate it, and we have no desire it should be carried out. Our belief is it would be rather injurious to us as a township. The work we now do to our own satisfaction would not be so well done, in the amalgamated township.

150. You have no hospital or infirmary!—We have Rathdown Union, and we have a hospital at Monkstown. Whenever anyone requires to be sent to hospital we can send them to Bright-street hospital in Dublin. The sick people in the township go to the Union and we have no trouble about it, they send their vehicles.

151. You are bound to have a disinfecting chamber and a mortuary!—We take great trouble to disinfect everything, we burn all infected articles.

152. Take the question of the fire brigade!—We do not want one; our own men see a fire brigade, and we pay for them when their services are required. We have a contract with a man for fleet horses to carry our hose to the scene of the fire.

153. Do you think that for such a district as Dalkey, Kingstown, and Blackrock, it is not desirable to have a well arranged fire brigade with a steam engine?—Both steam and hand engines have been thrown out of use in these places where they have high pressure, the high pressure water is just as good as any steam engine.

154. But would you not think it desirable to have, for the three townships, a fire brigade of trained men, who would be simply fire brigadiers?—I think each township might organize its own local fire brigade,

BLACKBURN.
Sept 2, 1873
Mr. J. H. —
Wigham

BLACKROCK,
Sept. 5, 1873.

Mr J. R.
Wigham.

and they might be more useful than a general set of
a great distance away.

155. In Penkridge and Rothnalnes, numbers of
people say they would gladly pay a few pounds more
in the year and have a fire brigade!

156. Mr. J. J. Esbjörn.—I have been here fifty
years, and I never saw a fire but two in the township.

157. The Committee of the House of Commons
having given it as their opinion, that under no circumstances
should one township be allowed to exist within
two miles of another—is there any reason why Blackrock,
Kingstown, and Dalkey should be allowed to
exist as separate townships?

Mr. Wigham.—I think there is; these townships
have been fixed, and they have managed their affairs
better than they were all in one township. We
have a bad specimen in Dublin of the way municipalities
are managed. If we found by practice that
Dublin was able to manage its own district, then we
would be able to consider the question of adding the
townships to it, but we do not see that they do, and
therefore we do not believe them when they say they
could manage the increased area with the same number
of Commissioners. My Board instructed me to say
they did not see any advantage that would arise from
the change, to them or the neighbouring townships.

158. There is a bridge tax thrown over the whole
district!—Yes, that is an equitable arrangement, and
the principle is a right one.

159. If the principle is right on what ground
should not the same districts contribute also to the
roads therethrough leading to the bridge?—I do not
see any objection to that. Any great public improvement,
the benefit of which is enjoyed by a large
number of people outside the improved district, should
contribute towards it, but that is a different thing
from managing local affairs.

160. To a very large extent are not the people
living in Blackrock merchants and men of business in
Dublin?—Yes.

Mr. Wigham, recalled

161. Do the markets of Dublin on which the Corporation
have expended £16,000 in your opinion come
under the head of metropolitan improvements?—I am
not very familiar with the work done by the cattle
market.

162. Are not almost all the sheep and cattle used
in Blackrock driven through the streets of Dublin?—
Don't the markets belong to the Corporation and don't
they derive a revenue from them? I don't know how
far they can be called a public improvement, but I
would say let all public improvements be dealt with in
a manner analogous to that adopted in the London
Metropolitan District.

163. There must be a new street opened up to the
new bridge, would you call that a metropolitan im-
provement?

164. Mr. Kavanagh, T.C.—The property there will be
increased in value and they will get larger taxes from
it.

165. Mr. Wigham.—If you can show me it will be
of use as a public improvement to the inhabitants of
this neighbourhood, then I say a small share of the
expense should be borne by this neighbourhood, that is the general principle that should be laid
down. Our franchise is £8, the franchise in King-

166. Do not they and their families use the streets
of the city largely?—They make their money in
Dublin.

167. Do you think there would be anything un-
fair to the people who are resident outside the city,
but within the metropolitan district, and who use
Dublin as largely as undoubtedly they do, if they were
asked to contribute something towards keeping the
streets of the city clean and repairing them?—I think
there is a difference between keeping up ordinary
streets and the cost of extraordinary works like
bridges. I think it would not be fair to ask them to
contribute to the ordinary maintenance of the streets.
We contribute our share of that when we come in to
do business, but it would be unfair to make us con-
tribute to such work and bear our own taxes here
as well.

168. What about the numbers who pay not one
shilling to the city?

Captain Rothne.—They travel by the railways and
trams which are rated, and they spend their
money in Dublin.

169. Mr. Kelly.—I agree in what has fallen from
Mr. Wigham as to the propriety of a limited liability
to the expenses of such great works as bridges in the
metropolis, but I do not go one inch beyond. It is
short-sighted to the last degree to say that we contribute
nothing to the city. We support the
merchants and they pay for the streets. In London
the sum for metropolitan works is not capricious,
unfair, and iniquitous, as it is here. In one part of
the Dublin Metropolitan District the man may miles
from the city must pay if he lives at Killiney, but if
he lives at Ballybough-bridge, within a short mile of
the city, he does not pay anything. Amalgamation would
be tearing up by the roots the principles on which
these townships have been formed, and if we are
thrown into Kingstown we are left practically un-
represented.

Mr. Wigham, recalled

170. Captain Rothne.—It is the unanimous opinion
of this Board that amalgamation with Kingstown and
Dalkey would be injurious to all; and we have not
seen a little of evidence that anything would be gained.

171. Mr. Wigham.—If you had a large district
it would be remarkable; we think we have a nice
workable district, our taxation is moderate and it
is decreasing.

172. Captain Rothne.—The formation of these three
townships into one would create one long narrow
strip very inaccessible.

173. Mr. Wigham.—There is an important point
which should be borne in mind; that our death rate
is lower than in any of the districts around Dublin,
and that rather bears out what I have been saying.

The inquiry then terminated.

DALKEY.—APRIL 24th, 1879.

PARKER,
April 24, 1879.

Before Mr. EXHAM, Q.C., Chairman, and Mr. C. P. COTTON, C.S.

The Commissioners sat in the Town Hall.

Mr. HENRY PARKERSON, J.P., examined.

Mr. Henry
Parkerson, J.P.

1. CHAIRMAN.—You are one of the Town Commissioners of Dalkey?—I am.

2. I believe you have been a Town Commissioner for some time?—I was the first. It was I who formed the township in 1858 under the Towns Improvement (Ireland) Act of 1854, and I drew out the boundaries.

3. Did you adopt that Act in full?—Yes. I may as well state that when drawing the boundaries we all felt that it would be much better to have taken in a large portion of Killiney, but to avoid opposition we carefully excluded any land connected with Killiney. When I submitted to Sir Richard Griffith the boundaries as traced out on the Ordnance map, he objected to them, and insisted on carrying them to the parish boundary edge by going down to Mr. Warren's demesne, and the alteration was made by the Government in the boundaries as originally marked out by me. The reason I state this was because at the time we thought Dalkey would be too small by itself; that it could not be economically worked unless we had a larger area.

4. Would you tell us what the boundary proposed at that time was?—Going up from Bullock Harbour, I went up the present boundary of Castle Park-road to Barnhill-gate.

3. Where is Barnhill-gate?—It is opposite the road leading down to Bullock Harbour. I will read from the Gazette.

6. What is the date of the Gazette?—The 18th of June, 1843.

7. Is the memorial published in the *Dublin Gazette*?—Yes, and containing the boundaries as I proposed them at the time. This is the official record of them, dated the 18th of June, 1843.

8. Are the boundaries you then proposed set forth in that Gazette?—Yes.

9. Was the boundary as proposed in the memorial at the south-easter end less than Sir Richard Griffith adopted?—Certainly; but it was for the purpose of avoiding opposition, and though we knew we were not doing what was right.

10. Are the boundaries as settled by Sir Richard Griffith the present boundaries?—Yes.

11. In the year 1867 you went in for a Township Act of your own?—Yes. I think I ought to state for your information that what made us form this into a township was that we were afraid that Kingstown would succeed in joining us to their township, and they did make an attempt, and we thought we would lose our own individuality, that we would have to pay towards the improvements of Kingstown, and that we would be forgotten, and that was the reason we took the step.

12. Mr. Robert Warren, M.P.—You said you took in the whole of Mr. Higgins' land?—I did.

13. I beg to state most distinctly that you are mistaken?—Well, we go very near it.

14. CHAIRMAN.—Are your bounds correctly set out on this map before me?—They are.

15. Mr. Warren.—It may save you some time if I state that the Dalkey township goes exactly up to the parish boundary.

Fitness.—That is what I say.

16. CHAIRMAN.—Does the Killiney boundary meet your boundary?—It does.

17. What is the number of acres within the present area?—592 acres.

18. It has been returned in the queries sent you by us, and answered by you as 570?—592 is the number from the extract from the census return of 1871. I have made it up.

19. Is the correct area given—the total area—as 572a, 0s. 3d.?—Yes.

20. How much of that is land at present?—I don't know, but there are 631 houses. There is very little land unbuilt on.

21. Can you give me the valuation of the houses and land?—Houses, £12,448 9s., and land, £1,023 10s., making altogether £13,511 10s.—that was last year's valuation, but since then we have increased some hundreds. There are more houses built in Dalkey than in any other part about.

22. What is the population of Dalkey?—2,584 according to the Census of 1871.

23. Will you give us the rates struck in Dalkey, we want them for the last five years?—The municipal rate was as follows, in 1874, 3s. 6d.; in 1875, 2s. 4d.; in 1876, 3s. 6d.; in 1877, 3s. 7d.; in 1878, 2s. 7d.

24. Then there is no county cost?—We have none. We compound for the county cost. We compound at 5d. in the pound.

25. For the county-at-large charges?—For imperative presentations.

26. And is that included in the above rates?—Yes.

27. Well then what is the 3s. 7d. for in 1878?—That includes sanitary rates, which were for making external drainage sewers.

28. What is the 3s. rate for?—For that we light, water, keep the roads in repair, and compound with the county.

29. What has been the poor rate?—We are in the Killiney electoral division. It is generally from 10d. to 1s.

30. Are you not in two electoral divisions?—Only a very small portion in Kingstown.

31. The two electoral divisions are Kingstown and Killiney?—Yes.

32. Have you the roads under your own control?—Yes.

33. And you are the Urban sanitary authority?—Yes.

34. Is there any debt on the township?—Yes.

35. What is it?—I would prefer that you would take it from the town clerk. What I want to get forward is this, that for a long time I was opposed to any attempt to join the district of Killiney and Ballybrack, but I afterwards saw, and I am still convinced, that it would be more for the advantage of Killiney and Ballybrack than of Dalkey to be joined, and I will state my figures and reasons. Each is too small to stand alone, it will end in our being annexed to Kingstown, and swallowed up in it. From the figures I find in the first place that the Killiney township is not a township at all, and I promise to be able to prove that. I can show you that according to the Act of Parliament Killiney could not possibly strike a rate at this moment legally, because under the Act of 1854, you will find by the 1st section that Killiney is not a town within the meaning of that Act, and I say that any ratepayer might go into the Court of Queen's Bench and restrain them and prevent them from striking a rate, and I believe that they have not struck a rate for some years. But they would get this advantage, they would get the benefit of our Act of Parliament which cost us £1,000—between £900 and £1,000—and they would get the control of the roads, and better sanitary inspection, which I believe is better carried out in Dulkey.

36. By our Commission we are bound to inquire into all the towns mentioned in Mr. O'Brien's report, and one of these is Killiney, and it is stated to be under the Towns Improvement Act. We must, therefore,

DALKEY,
April 26, 1873
Mr Harry
Parkes, Esq.

fore, make it a legally established township—I shall not say any more upon that subject. I only state my view as a lawyer, and I am borne out by the opinions of other legal gentleman, that they have no power to levy a rate at the present on Town Commissioners.

36 Mr. WARREN.—Will you excuse me for saying that we have made a rate and as many as we have required, and we will make another if we want it?

37 CUSHNAM.—We cannot go into that question. We must treat it as a township—I make that statement, and there is the Act of Parliament. That is my opinion, and I would say that it would be to the advantage of the Killiney Commissioners to be put in a position to control the township.

38 What is the rating in Killiney?—The present taxation of Killiney is thus—they are paying about 3s. id. I think, altogether, and to that the county cess in their township must be added, whatever it is. But of course I am speaking under the correction of the Killiney people who are present. But put Killiney at 3s. in the pound, and suppose we were joined together and made into one township, such a rate would produce £1,222 17s. a year, and for that they would get rid of the county rate, and they would have their roads taken care of, and they would be lighted and watered, and have sanitary inspection.

39 You, but have you considered this, Mr. Parkinson, they would be made the Urban sanitary authority if they were annexed to you, and the moment they do that the occupier has to pay the whole of the sanitary rate or he gets nothing back from his landlord!—The "owner or occupier" it says.

40 It is the occupier, if there is one; if the head is not occupied the owner pays it. The occupier, if it becomes the Urban sanitary authority, would get nothing back from the landlord, whereas Killiney at present being under the control of the Rural sanitary authority, the occupier pays the rate in the first instance, but gets half the sanitary rate back, so that you have the owner paying half the sanitary rate in one case, and in the other case you don't make him pay a farthing!—Well, there is a great diversity of opinion upon that point. It is said that the occupier should pay the rates because it is he who causes the nuisance and not the landlord. This is a vexed question.

41 It was a vexed question up to last year as to the sanitary rate, and it is a vexed question now, whether the whole of the rates should not be thrown exclusively upon the landlord and tenant. That is a vexed question. As far as the Public Health Act deals with the question by it in the case of the rural sanitary authority they are not. In view of that how would you suggest that it would be desirable that the Killiney and Ballybrack people should be brought into Dalkey—would it not be for the benefit of the landlord and not for the benefit of the occupier?—The advantages the last named would derive would counterbalance that. The advantage would be for Killiney and not for Dalkey—I do not see what Killiney could lose by the transaction. We have £1,863 11s. 3d. that is our income; whereas Killiney has only £1,222 17s. a year—that is at 3s. in the pound, and there are six miles of roads in Killiney that would have to be taken charge of.

42 Don't you think those six miles of roads would not cost as much as three miles of the Dalkey township?—You have only laid out at present up to this year £266 3s. that was spent on the roads in Killiney last year.

43 Do you think the roads in Killiney are kept in a worse condition than the roads of Dalkey?—Some of the roads I think ought to be kept in a better condition than they are.

44 Mr. CORRIGAN.—In Killiney—I certainly think so. I think there should be great supervision. I think there should be £400 a year laid out on the roads of Killiney.

45 Do I understand you to say that annexation would be more for the advantages of Killiney than of

Dalkey?—Yes, the only advantage we might derive from that, we might reduce the entire rate by £1., say from 3s. to 2s. 10d.

46 I don't see why you want that!—Because I think that otherwise Dalkey might be ultimately annexed to Kingstown.

47 You want to use Dalkey then as a sort of fender against Kingstown?—If the two of us are together we would be left alone.

48 Are you aware that the people of Kingstown have expressed it as their intention not to seek any extension—I am well aware of it, but I know that secretly a great many of them are in favour of joining us to Kingstown.

49 CHAPMAN.—What would the Dalkey people say to that?—They would object to it, and that is why we are doing our best to improve the township.

50 What is to be done with the police arrangements? At present Killiney is in the county!—A portion of it is in the metropolitan police district, what reaches up to the top of Killiney Hill.

51 What do you say to the Ballybrack people?—I don't think it would follow, because if we are made into one township, that the metropolitan district should stand in the way. On the contrary, I think it is in contemplation, and that the Government are going to sacrifice the metropolitan police district to Kingstown, and not go on to Dalkey.

52 There has not been one word said on the subject, or a hint given, that there was any desire in any way to suggest that as the part of the Parliamentary Committee or in their report!—Be it so, but I don't think it is consequent upon it either if the townships are amalgamated that the metropolitan police district must be extended.

53 If you extend this township, and add to the metropolitan police district (you are, ipsa facto, extending the metropolitan police district as defined by Dalkey township)—you do that if you extend Dalkey township?—I don't think so. The same question would have arisen in the case of annexation of Drummessla with Dublin, because Drummessla is not in the metropolitan police district the whole way, because there is the Drummessla Petty Sessions Court.

54 Is it your proposal then that the metropolitan police district shall remain as it is?—I would not propose anything about it, that is for the Government to consider. I don't think it is necessary or expedient to extend the metropolitan police district any farther than it is. That I don't think follows upon it at all.

55 What would you say to the bridge tax—how would it affect the added district?—If the metropolitan police district is not extended the bridge tax won't follow, because it is levied over the metropolitan police district.

56 Have you any wards?—No; I think, if the two townships were amalgamated, it would be very desirable to divide them into wards for the purpose of having the different districts in the locality represented. Sometimes when a township is not divided into wards the Commissioners are returned as one set of men either from the apathy or carelessness of the rest of the electors. If it was divided into wards, I think each district would be represented. I would propose to divide the two townships—if they were amalgamated into one—into six or eight wards.

57 Is it your proposition to light all the roads in the district you propose to annex in the same way that you light Dalkey?—I think that they should be lighted as they are.

58 Why as they are—do you propose that you are to go to the very furthest point of the district that you propose to bring in, and give it the same advantages that you give here?—I think that should be done.

59 That is, that you should lay mains and light the roads the whole way?—I think so.

60 And supply water also!—Certainly.

61 Did you calculate what debt you would incur by doing that—because you would have to raise money for it—have you calculated what money it would cost

to lay the mains!—We would not have to do that if it was all one township, because the Gas Company would lay the mains.

62. The Gas Company would lay the mains!—Certainly. Until then we would have to purchase. We did this: we used to pay in this township so much a year for each lamp, but afterwards we bought our own lamps from the Gas Company. They gave us time to purchase them, and now the lamps are our own.

63. Would you propose to buy and give the same lamps to Killiney and Ballybrack as there are in Dalkey—and would you propose to light them the same way as you do in Dalkey?—We light by meter. The reason we bought our lamps was this: the Gas Company would not enter into an arrangement with us to light our township, unless we paid so much a year for each lamp, they sending us the lamps. We, for economy's sake, bought our lamps, and put a meter upon every twelfth lamp. We own the lamp-head, and now we pay for what we consume, which is, of course, the most economical way, because there are some moonlight nights when there is no necessity to light them.

64. What is the distance between every lamp in Dalkey?—There are seventy lamps for ten miles of road—an average of seven lamps each mile.

65. If you had ten miles of road added you would want sixty lamps!—Yes, certainly.

66. Do you think you could light to that extent?—I think so.

67. How much is paid for each lamp at present?—£1 5s. a year. I just pay £1 60 for lighting. The only reason I would advocate the joining of the two townships is, because I think the two could be more economically worked than one—with one staff of officers. I would not, however, alter the number of the Bonds.

68. How many Commissioners have you here?—Twelve. I think it is well to have a large district well represented.

69. Would you propose to consolidate the townships, and have twelve Commissioners for Dalkey, and the same for Killiney and Ballybrack?—I would have it either twenty-four, or I would reduce Dalkey and Killiney and Ballybrack, and have an equal number for each, because I think the population is the same or close upon it.

70. You are aware, I suppose, that in Dublin the Corporation do not propose to include Clontarf on the ground that Clontarf is separated from the city boundary by about a quarter of a mile of agricultural land, and they say that makes the difference between it and the other townships, and that it cannot be considered that Clontarf is a natural extension of Dublin on account of the land intervening. Suppose such a principle as that exists, do you not think that there is a greater natural barrier to the annexation of Dalkey and Killiney, where you have the great range of Killiney hills intervening?—But there is a large portion of building ground there, and they are building on it at present.

71. Yes, building on it in a few detached villas, but not as a town. In the other townships they run into one another by tenements and regular streets of houses, and so on. The Corporation of Dublin say—"We don't want to take in Clontarf because there is that barrier of arable land interposing." If that be so would not the existence of those hills be a much stronger argument against bringing in Killiney and Ballybrack, and attaching it to Dalkey?—The size of the intervening ground is not so great.

72. It is infinitely more than a quarter of a mile!—Well, there are no detached villas all the way.

73. So there are in many towns in England in which they have refused to bring in outside districts if they are not populous places!—I think all these objections can be fairly met by the great advantage that Killiney would derive by being annexed to Dalkey, because the population of each township is too small for a

township, and we would get a greater quantity of water if the townships were joined together.

74. If the Killiney people say—"We are satisfied to remain as we are," You are not satisfied to remain as you are!—As regards being satisfied, we have all along wished to remain as we are, but now we have told you that we think annexation would be for the advantage of both.

75. Don't you think it would be for the advantages of both, and more in accordance with what is done in other places, if you got joined to Kingstown, where you run up to the sea?—If you say you are too small then why should you say that you would wish to be joined to this place with a barrier of natural hills, and bring in a wholly agricultural district. It is not as if you were going to annex a portion of the existing district on the ground of its proximity to the town, and containing houses, &c., that derived benefit from that proximity; but there is a new township which you want to absorb into yours. Would you not consider, in coming to any decision on the point, the view of the Corporation with regard to Clontarf, that township should not be amalgamated when there is an almost impassable barrier between them?—I am glad to say it is not an impassable barrier between them. I must also say that the Killiney people make use of Dalkey for shopping and different other things. They are supplied by Dalkey to a great extent, and make use of our roads, and come into our township, and, therefore, there is not say impassable barrier. And we must not forget that the train brings them from Killiney to Dalkey, and, I know, as a matter of fact, that they come to market in this town. As regards the debt, I would propose that, if the two townships were amalgamated, each township should bear its own responsibilities, and I have not thought of saddling Killiney and Ballybrack with the debt of Dalkey.

76. Bearing in mind that you are the road authority here, what is your view with regard to the arable land in your township—at present its share of the taxation is that it pays on only one-fourth of the valuation!—Oh, it is decreasing every year.

77. Because it is being built on!—Yes. I suppose there are more houses being built, and that have been built, in Dalkey than in Kingstown within the last three years.

78. If the ground were altogether built on, and if you had double your valuation, would you then be large enough to stay as you are!—Yes, I dare say we will improve. We increased last year £600 on the valuation, and the year £300 on odd pounds.

79. Supposing things remain as they are, what is your view with regard to the arable land paying only one-fourth of the real rates—a fourth of what it costs to keep up the roads—what do the roads cost!—The engineer will give you the exact amount of the money we laid out on the roads.

80. You understand my question. Here is a township, and the land in that township only pays the road rate on one-fourth of its valuation. Take a field, the middle of which may be the line of the township boundary, one side of that field only pays rates towards the keeping up of the road on a fourth of its valuation, and the other side of that imaginary line pays the full road rate in the nature of county cess. In your opinion is that right and proper!—I think that would require redress, no doubt it seems not right. I forgot to mention one advantage which Dalkey would gain, and the absence of it is a very serious drawback here. There are some of the ratepayers who have no water, because the supply is taken from the reservoir at Stillorgan, and owing to the distance it comes along through the main, and the friction, it does not rise to a height sufficient to supply the houses in Mount Talbot and Mount Henry. All the families there are in want of water.

81. You say those people are not supplied at present, because Stillorgan is not capable of supplying that place at present!—[Witness having pointed out the

DALKEY.
April 21, 1870
Mr. Henry
Parkes, J.P.

DALKEITH
April 24, 1878.
Mr. Henry
Fitzgerald Esq.

locality in question on the map] Yes. They have to pay the water rate while the Commissioners cannot give them water, and it is at present a great hardship on us. About 600 of the inhabitants can get no water at all owing to the supply being taken from the Stillogan reservoir, and the friction and waste is so great before it rises, that it is not able to reach level for the use of the people there. If we could get a partial supply from Rathmichael, or the Dangle relieving tank or any other source, that would weigh in my mind very seriously in trying to get the boundaries of the township extended.

81. How is Killiney supplied?—From Rathmichael.

82. Under agreement with the Corporation?—Yes, under an agreement between the Corporation and the Poor Law Guardians.

83. Is there anything in that agreement to make it extend to any extension of Killiney?—I think not.

84. Would the Corporation refuse to supply you?—I think we might be able to arrange with them.

85. Is there anything to prevent the Corporation from refusing to supply the place you refer to?—I am inclined to think that we could compel the Corporation by legal proceedings to supply them.

86. Then why do you want the extension to Killiney for that reason?—Because I think the matter would be facilitated.

87. Do you think if there was amalgamation that, as a matter of course, the same arrangements would be extended to you?—I think so. There is the same main

88. Have you asked the Corporation whether they would agree?—I have not.

89. Do you think the pipes at Rathmichael would be sufficient to supply you?—I think so.

90. Have you ascertained whether the mains at Killiney would be sufficient to supply Dalkey?—I have so. The engineer can tell you. I think it would be a great benefit to the township. It is very embarrassing to the Commissioners that these people pay rates and get no advantages.

91. Mr. Corlett.—Is it not one of the advantages of amalgamation that there would be a decrease of expenditure under the head of salaries, on account of one staff only being required?—Yes.

92. What are the salaries?—The Town Clerk can tell you.

93. What economy would result from amalgamation?—I should say there would be a saving of from £300 to £400 or £500 a year, and thereby we would be able to lessen taxation.

94. I don't see how you put that out?—Well, I think so.

95. CHAIRMAN.—Suppose you add to the number of roadways, you must give the engineer an increase of salary?—Yes, I have calculated that.

96. Mr. Corlett.—Are not these roads superintended by the County Surveyor?—Yes.

97. You could not reduce his salary?—No, he would be overpaid, but you would have the advantage that does not now exist, that the roads would be under their control.

98. But I am talking of the economy of salaries—I don't say where it is!—The calculation I made was at 3s. in the pound (they are paying, at present, 3s. Id. in Killiney township) would produce about £1,200 a year, and for that they would get better roads.

99. You are talking of greater efficiency—not economy!—Yes, but I am going to show you that there would be a total saving. There are only twenty lamps lighted at Killiney, and I have put them down as thirty, that is ten additional to start with, and I have given £100 a year for extras—perhaps an increase of salary to the engineer and sanitary inspector.

100. Of how much £100 a year for both. I calculate a total expenditure of £730, and the 3s. rate would produce £1,232, and there would, therefore, be a saving of £400 a year. You could reduce the taxation to 3s. in the pound by that saving of £400 odd, and you are paying 2s. Id. now.

101. That won't be economy in salaries—but it will be economy in the aggregate. We have three sets of officers.

102. What are they, and how are they paid?—I cannot tell you.

103. CHAIRMAN.—I think you are laboring under a little mistake. At Killiney, at present, as well as I recollect, the poor rate and the sanitary rate is £s. 11d. In the pound!—We didn't take the poor rate in, in my calculation.

104. At Killiney the poor rate is £s. 11d., and the sanitary one, £s. 10d.—2s. 6d. for the extra.

Mr. CORLETT.—2s. 6d.

105. CHAIRMAN.—2s. 6d. is the rate at Killiney, at present. The occupier deducts half £s. 11d. from his landlord, and leaves his rate 2s. 7d. for all.

106. Then there is the township rate.

107. There is no township rate—but they are going to strike a rate. I don't think it would be fair taking it on that basis.

108. They cannot strike more than £s. 1—I am aware of that.

109. Then suppose you put £s. rate on that would make it 3s. 7d.!—But I said 2s. Id.

110. At present your rate—taking it for the last year—is 3s. 7d. plus poor rate, and what is your poor rate?—Our poor rate, I think, is 1s.

111. That brings it up to £s. Id. If you propose to take in Killiney and Ballybrack you must cover it!—That is for their option, perhaps they would not want it.

112. Take your rate at 2s. 7d., and take 6d. off that for the landlord's proportion of the poor rate, and that makes your rate 2s. 1d. on the occupier against 3s. 7d. in Killiney!—Yes, but you roads are not under your own control, and the sanitary inspection is very imperfect.

113. Do you recollect the view Mr. Lawrie and I took of the roads of Dalkey?—We have made great strides since that time. You have no sewerage in Killiney at all, but we have an excellent system of sewage in Dalkey, which will be completed in one or two years.

114. Mr. Corlett.—Has the population increased very much since 1871?—Owing to the census being taken in April, it is not a fair criterion of the population of Dalkey at all, and we labour under a serious disadvantage in that way on account of the allowance of water at the rate of twenty gallons per head per day. Our average population, instead of being regarded as 2,584 in Dalkey proper, is close on 5,000. At any rate, I say that 5,000 would be more like our population, taking winter and summer together, because ours is a place of summer residence.

115. Has the population increased since the last census?—I think so, considerably.

116. The houses you gave me [63]—was that in 1871?—Yes.

117. Have the houses increased?—Yes, very rapidly. 118. Have they become one-third more?—I should say they have. For instance, at Ulverton Road one set of houses has been built along there the whole way down. The valuation in 1871 was £9,000; now it is £13,000 odd. I am still convinced, I may say in conclusion, that it would be a benefit to both districts if they were united. By doing so we would derive more advantage in the way of water.

119. How is the 2s. made up?—2s. for Grand Jury one, our rate 2s., and then we have the sanitary rate.

120. How is the 2s. made up?—I think you had better get that from the Town Clerk.

121. CHAIRMAN.—Supposing that Killiney and Ballybrack were not added, what would you say to your being added to Kingstown?—I would object very strongly.

122. Mr. Corlett.—On what ground?—On the ground that I think we would be only a very small part of such a township. I think we would be snuffed out by such an amalgamation. I do not approve of the way that Kingstown is carried on at all.

The Rev. Mr. Coslett, D.C.L., examined.

122. CHAIRMAN.—We shall be happy to hear your views on the subject of such an amalgamation as Mr. Parkinson has suggested—I may state that I am Curate of Killiney and Ballybreck, and, of course, with regard to what I would say in this matter, I have no knowledge whatever of financial matters, and I can only look at the proposed amalgamation on certain general principles that would strike every person. I have been in Ballybreck and Killiney for some time the pastor of a large portion of the district, containing, I believe, something like 1,000 or 1,300 persons, and I should say that it would be a very bad thing for Killiney and Ballybreck if this amalgamation were carried out. What strikes me forcibly is this: there exists between the two places a natural barrier of mountains, and unless we could get the hills of Killiney carried away, I don't see how we could be amalgamated. The difference between the two peoples on each side of the hill is very marked. I think when people come here in the train, they feel that they have arrived at a terminus, and that when they go further they are getting on a new line altogether. That strikes everyone. With regard to the people I should say they are not at all likely to be amalgamated well. These natural boundaries create great differences. Furthermore, supposing they were amalgamated, there are two classes of people here in Dalkey—property, and business, and trade, and they are largely represented, and would be very strongly represented on the township. And on our side it is nearly all made up of the gentry, and holders of detached villas, and these two bodies look at affairs from different points of view. I don't think the thing would work. Another thing that strikes me is that, to a great extent, the different qualities of the people are against it. If there is one thing that I admire in the Dalkey character it is this, that they look upon themselves as a little city, and there is a sort of citizenship in the whole of the town. It is a very admirable state of things, and out of that spirit will arise the future prosperity of Dalkey, but we all know that the spirit in its way is a little bit exclusive, and if we were added to the town we would become outsiders, we would be not only outside in geographical position, but also in spirit. So far, then, I think the good qualities of the Dalkey people are against amalgamation. On our side I have consulted the people of Killiney, and they are one and all clear against it. I spoke to several here on the subject also. I know the gentry belonging to our communion, and they are entirely against it. With regard to the advantages that Dalkey gives Killiney, I may say that I know that the people of Killiney sleep in Killiney, and I think a great number of the gentry, and all the Bally-

breck people come down to my church. For these reasons I would be against amalgamation. With reference to the sanitary work being done by the Commissioners, I may mention that some time ago we had a dispensary doctor living in Ballybreck, and he was then in the centre of his district; but we have not a dispensary in Ballybreck, and our people must carry their empty bottles for medicine to Cabinteely, and the medicine cannot be got at Ballybreck. Now that has been changed, and the dispensary doctor is changed to Dalkey. No doubt it is right that he is obliged to go to Cabinteely, but if a bad case happened in the night a person would have to travel over a small range of mountains to get a doctor. We hope to put an end to that state of things. Suppose we were amalgamated with Dalkey, that state of things would continue to exist. The dispensary doctor would still live at Dalkey, and we would have to do the best we could, and it would be very hard for the poor.

123. Mr. Anthony O'Neill.—Do you think where there are 400 people who have not got a drop of water, it would be a source of great advantage if they got a water supply?—Yes, a great advantage.

124. CHAIRMAN.—Would you object to bring Killiney and Ballybreck into Dalkey, if you were thereby brought within the Metropolitan Police district?—I would. I would not like the public-houses to be open on Sundays. We were troubled enough in that way before. I think the Constabulary even manage better than the Metropolitan Police. The people on the other side of the hill at Killiney object to it, and are very much against it.

125. Do you think the roads of the Dalkey township are kept better than those of Killiney?—I certainly do not. Of course there are a great many in Dalkey.

126. Mr. A. O'Neill.—From whence are the Killiney people supplied with coal?—Principally from Ballybreck.

127. Does not Mr. Duggan supply the whole of Killiney and Ballybreck?—I think most of the coals for the places about us are supplied from Ballybreck.

128. Surely whoever supplies it must bring it from Dalkey?—He brings it direct from Kingstown.

129. Mr. Parkinson.—Do you mean to say that all the people shop in Killiney?—Yes, the vast majority of them.

130. Don't they get their meat from Mr. Lamb in Dalkey?—They may get that.

131. And their bread?—They get some of it, and the most, and their groceries.

132. Do you know the height of Killiney hill?—500 feet.

Examination of Mr.

PARKINSON resumed.

Mr. Parkinson.

133. CHAIRMAN.—Can you give us the area, population, and valuation of this district, that cannot be supplied with water from Scullionan reservoir—I could, in a few minutes.

134. What proportion does it bear to the rest of the township?—My property alone there is seven acres, which is built on—that is the Mount Sutton property, of which I am owner in fee.

135. How many acres are those?—I should say close upon fifty acres. I think that would be the area of the place not supplied with water, and I should say there are not 500 inhabitants.

136. Is it situated, in the highest part, next to Killiney township?—Not all of it, it adjoins the Killiney township from the extreme western extremity.

137. Mr. Warren.—Do you consider that you have

the support of all the ratepayers of Dalkey to the proposed amalgamation?—I never said I had, I only express my own opinion.

Mr. Warren.—I had the honour of holding the first meeting in Dalkey, in 1863, at the request of my friend Mr. Burke, and I would be very glad to have the opinion of the first Chairman of the Dalkey Commissioners, as to whether he approves of the amalgamation of Killiney to Dalkey.

CHAIRMAN.—We would like to take the opinion of the Commissioners, as a body, first, if they are agreed on the subject, and if not to take the individual opinions of the Commissioners, and then any ratepayer can come forward and tender evidence in opposition to, or in favour of, the proposition of the Commissioners.

DALKEY
April 24, 1872
The Rev. Mr.
Coslett, D.C.L.

DALKEY,
April 26, 1909.
Mr. JAMES M.
Burke,

MR. JAMES MILE BURKE, examined.

138. CHAIRMAN.—You are a magistrate of the county, and were Chairman of the Dalkey Township Commissioners for some time?—Yes.

139. Are you on the Board now?—I am not. I believe I am the highest ratepayer who lives in the township.

140. You have heard the opinion expressed by Mr. Parkinson, that he and other Commissioners think it desirable and advantageous to bring in Killiney and Ballybrack into the existing township of Dalkey?—I would be very happy, if I could, to agree with the Commissioners, for whom I have the highest respect and feel that they are doing their best for the township, but, I think, on the ground of economy, annexation would be a great mistake. It would be a great mistake, in my opinion, to attach a large struggling district to a compact township like this; because, as a matter of course, if you join Ballybrack and Killiney you must give them the same advantages as Dalkey enjoys. You must light, sewer, drain, and so on, and I don't see where the funds could possibly come from for the purpose, and I think it would unquestionably be adding (if we were bound to pay our portion of this expenditure, which, I suppose, we would) more to our rates, and we would be great losers.

141. By the law as it stands, the arable land there would only pay a fourth of the rate on its valuation?—I know that. I know in this town for the purpose of making sewerage, both outlet and internal sewerage, a very large sum has to be borrowed, and a large sum has been already borrowed which has been usefully employed; but a portion of the township requires drainage still, and I understand that the Commissioners are about borrowing money for the purpose of having the thing completed, and I see no difficulty in the completion of the sewerage when outlets are properly constructed.

142. If Killiney and Ballybrack are brought in should they not be properly severed about?—Yes. If I lived there—in Killiney and Ballybrack—I would require to have sewerage made for my sewage, and I don't see where you would get the outlet. I know, as a member of the Board of Guardians, the difficulty we have to get an outlet for the sewage of our workhouse.

143. Does it go low?—Yes. The difficulty is to get an outlet from not having any compulsory power. There is plenty of fall, but we cannot get an outlet without the consent of the owner of the land for that purpose.

144. Do you think it could be fairly said that either Killiney or Ballybrack were suburban districts of Dalkey?—I think not. I think they are quite distinct parts of a district in themselves; and I would object, as a ratepayer here, and I am quite sure that if the opinion of the ratepayers here was taken they would object, as a body, to any such extension.

145. From your experience, do you think that the proposed annexation of Killiney to Dalkey would meet the approval of the ratepayers?—I think not.

146. If your rate was reduced by 4d., as Mr. Parkinson thinks, what would your opinion be?—Well, I declare, I would like to see that explained first, before I came to say other conclusion than the one I have expressed.

147. If the Dalkey people were sure they would save 4d. by the annexation of Killiney and Ballybrack, do you think they would be in favour of such an arrangement?—When I take into consideration that it is necessary now for sanitary and sewerage purposes here, to borrow a large sum of money, if they tax that over Dalkey, which is partially served at present, and that the same was required for Killiney and Ballybrack, it would take an enormous sum of money, and who is to pay it? Is it to come off the amalgamated district, or will each district have to pay its own share? I am altogether against amalgamation.

148. Have you heard any opinion expressed on the part of the ratepayers here—do they wish it?—I was not aware that this inquiry was to be held until I saw it mentioned in this morning's *Freeman's Journal*.

149. MR. PARKINSON.—If it was proved by figures that 4d. in the pound would be saved would you then be in favour of amalgamation, as suggested?—I think from the means taken to economise everything, and from the vested position of affairs in the township you should be able to reduce the rates sufficiently, and I would rather remain as I am and economise in our own township, than run into additional expense by adding to it.

150. If the two townships were amalgamated, don't you think, from your experience, that the constitution of this Board would be materially improved—don't you think that would be so if the two were joined?—There is a political question involved in that.

151. I ask you now, on general principles and irrespective of politics, don't you think the position of Dalkey would be improved, as regards the responsibility of the representatives?—It altogether depends on the qualification of the voter.

152. I wish a direct answer to that!—If you mean that the Board would be composed of persons holding a more respectable position in society—professional men, or gentlemen living on their property altogether, I would say that these persons might be induced to come into the Board, and having heard what Father Conlon stated—that the feelings of those persons who would be joined are so different from the feelings of the persons here, that the Board would not be composed of such elements as would be consenting, and that the Board might be formed of different elements, it might not, in my opinion, work a bit better.

153. CHAIRMAN.—You heard Mr. Parkinson's suggestion as to the formation of the Board of Commissioners, if this amalgamation was carried out—what would your opinion be as to that?—I am satisfied with the way in which things are going on now, and I would be very sorry to meddle with the present arrangements. I think they should just let well alone.

MR. PARKINSON, re-examined.

154. MR. CORRON.—Can you give me the population and valuation of the district of Dalkey that cannot be supplied from Stillorgan?—I should say that there would be about from 300 to 400 inhabitants.

MR. ROBERT WARRE, D.L., examined.

155. CHAIRMAN.—You are a Deputy Lieutenant and magistrate of the county, and one of the directors of the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway?—Yes.

156. You are also Chairman of the Killiney and

Ballybrack township?—Yes, since the formation of that township.

157. Are you a ratepayer in Dalkey township?—Yes.

158. You have heard the proposition made here on

Mr. Robert
Warre, D.L.

the part of the Commissioners—what is your opinion as to its expediency or otherwise?—I am decidedly opposed to it in every way, and I don't know whether I am at liberty to say that apart from being a Commissioner and Chairman of the Killiney Township Commissioners, I am very deeply and personally interested. I have a very large property in the neighbourhood of Killiney—worth between £15,000 and £20,000, and, I think, therefore, I should have a voice in anything that is suggested. I am decidedly opposed to it. I have also the authority of the entire body of the Killiney Board, eleven Commissioners, and I have my friend, Mr. Bramley, here to corroborate me, if necessary. I have also the authority of one of our Commissioners elected the other day—Sir Robert Kane—also of Mr. Justice Fitzgerald—a large ratepayer, and one who was instrumental in asking us to get up the township originally, and he is decidedly opposed to it, and has authorised me to state so here to-day, and I have the authority of the Town Commissioners of Killiney and Ballybreck, as I have already stated.

160. First of all you are a ratepayer of Dalkey. Taking it from the Dalkey point of view, do you think it would be an advantage to the Dalkey people, if the annexation took place?—Mr. Parkinson asked Mr. Burke whether it would not improve the position of Dalkey. Well, I cannot say what the effect of some new road from Killiney and Ballybreck might be. Whether my friend, Mr. Hart, Mr. Brasley, Sir Robert Kane or others would think differently to myself I cannot say, but I certainly would not be a Commissioner of Dalkey. I have no hesitation in saying that.

161. For the Dalkey people themselves do you think there would be any advantage?—No, unless what I hear stated is the fact, that they would endeavour to save for themselves at the cost of Killiney and Ballybreck. I don't think there would be any advantage to the people of Dalkey. I believe the Town Commissioners of Dalkey are very heavily in debt; that is the general impression.

162. As a ratepayer of Dalkey, suppose that Killiney and Ballybreck were annexed, is it your opinion that Dalkey on taking up Killiney should light, cleanse it, &c.?—I don't think we have Dalkey itself so advantageously off at present as regards that. There is not a single light from the time you leave the Dalkey station until you come up to the boundary of Killiney and Ballybreck township. We cannot induce the Dalkey Commissioners to give us light. If any people are coming from their respective places of worship there is not a single light from the time you leave the station until you get to the place where our township begins—that is a distance of 1,160 yards or nearly three-quarters of a mile that we are left without a light.

163. Is there any difference in the way the roads are kept in the two townships, because Mr. Parkinson thinks the roads would be much better kept at Killiney if that township was annexed to Dalkey?—Quite the contrary, because the road which is the boundary, from Dalkey—avenue going down from Mr. Pinn's is kept in a very scandalous state and has been much worse than heretofore. Several vehicles break down there lately, I myself saw that often coming up there and frequently sent out a horse to help people to come up, that is right opposite Mr. Frost's. When Mr. Collis's furniture was coming out lately the rats in the roads were so great that the van was upset.

164. What about the water supply?—The Killiney and Ballybreck township gets a supply from the Rathmichael reservoir—that is what we call the receiving tank. It was never intended to supply any place from that tank, but having appealed to the Corporation the water works committee bought it before the Council seeing the deplorable state we were in in Killiney that we could not get a supply from Stillorgan, as that is only 270 feet high, whereas a great portion of our district is 400 feet and the Rathmichael reservoir supplies up to 340 feet—so you can see

with difficulty. In the higher ground we do not sometimes get the water; it is not continuous during all the portions of the day and a great many people naturally complained and objected to pay the rates because they could not get the water. My argument is that if you annex Killiney and Ballybreck to Dalkey and attempt to supply a portion of Dalkey out of the Rathmichael tank you will lose the ability to supply the existing demand to Killiney and Ballybreck. It does not matter to me whether the population is 500 or 200, but if you supply 100 houses with water at twenty gallons a day each—that is 2,000 gallons—and you take that quantity from Killiney and give it to Dalkey. Mr. Neville, the Engineer to the Corporation, told me long ago that it would be impossible with the existing supply at Rathmichael, that that source could supply Dalkey without interfering with Killiney.

165. Mr. Parkinson—Does not all the water given to you from the Ventry come through Rathmichael before it comes to Stillorgan?—I am not able to say.

166. Were you not opposed to the formation of this locality into a township at first?—I was opposed to this very much. Mr. Parkinson has stated in his evidence before you that the township as originally formed excluded any land in Killiney. Well, sir, I beg to state that the reason I opposed it was this—that it did not exclude a portion of land in Killiney, which was included and remains included still, and Mr. Pinn and I as the owners of the land complain of it as a very great hardship—that is a portion of Seapredian whicoh is in the electoral division of Killiney. It is also I understand in contravention of the Act of Parliament in reference to townlands for poor law purposes, inasmuch as it divides a townland which the Act contemplated was never to be divided. It also brings into the township of Dalkey portion of the parish of Killiney, all the remaining portion of that parish being in the township of Killiney. It also includes the road between my place—Wynne—and Mr. Pinn's, which I have just complained of.

167. CHAIRMAN.—Does it include the entire or only half of that road?—The entire of it.

168. Mr. Parkinson—Are you not aware that the boundary was fixed, and afterwards altered by Sir Richard Griffith?—My observations were in reply to your question whether I opposed the formation of the township, and I deny that I did.

169. Were you not opposed to the formation of this township?—I had not any ground in it.

170. As an inhabitant of the district?—I was not an inhabitant of the district.

171. Did you not oppose? You were the nearest magistrate and we required to have the memorial or requisition to have a general meeting of the ratepayers signed by the two nearest magistrates, and didn't you refuse to sign that?—I did, on the ground I have mentioned.

172. Though we excluded your property?—You did not exclude it, and it is in it still.

173. We didn't put it in, Sir Richard Griffith did so?—Yes.

174. CHAIRMAN.—Did Sir Richard Griffith put in a larger boundary than you wanted?

Mr. Parkinson.—Yes.

Wynne.—Then we have the less hesitation in saying that we should get back what you didn't want formerly.

175. Mr. Parkinson.—Don't you think it is a great hardship on the parishes here in the township of Dalkey not to have water?—I really won't mix myself up with Dalkey at all. All I can say is this—that the people of Killiney complain very bitterly that they should have to pay for water and not get it.

176. Do you think you are in a satisfactory position in Killiney with regard to sanitary arrangements?—I think it is a great deal better than of Dalkey had it.

177. Why do you say that?—From what I hear of everything connected with Dalkey.

178. Are you aware how?—I heard that Dr. Tu-

DALKEY
APRIL 23, 1874.
Mr. Robert
Warren, Esq.,

DALKEY
April 24, 1899
—
Mr. Robert
Warren, M.P.

well made great complaints, and also from my conclusions from newspaper reports.

179. Do you know how it is done?—I do not.

180. Are you aware that the sanitary sergeant is under the control of the police?—No.

181. Are you aware that this is the only township worked in the same way, by the leave of the Local Government Board?—I am not.

182. Have you the same system?—We are not a Sanitary Authority.

183. Have you any inspection?—We are not the Sanitary Authority.

184. Why are you not?—Because it was taken from us. A great many people think we could manage the work much better.

185. Are you aware that the Inspector employed by the Poor Law Union is very seldom sent about Killiney?—We see not the Sanitary Authority. I hear he is not seen there very frequently. There are two or three things which I wish to correct, if you will allow me. They occurred in Mr. Parkinson's evidence. He said as a reason for the annexation of Killiney and Ballybrough to Dalkey, that he was afraid Dalkey would be brought into Kingstown. Our reason for finding ourselves into a township was because we were afraid that we would be brought into Dalkey. He has stated the number of acres in Dalkey as compared with the number in Killiney. I think Mr. Parkinson's proportion should be condemned by his own evidence. There are 592 acres in Dalkey by his evidence, while in Killiney and Ballybrough there are 1,006, and I don't think the smaller should swallow up the larger, but that is the way he tries to impress you, but we don't see it. He also stated that Killiney is not a township within the meaning of the Act. I object to such a statement as that.

186. Mr. Parkinson.—Do you think your roads are kept as they should be?—Indeed they might be kept better.

187. Are you aware of the amount expended last year on them?—I forgot the amount.

188. Have you heard that only £156 was expended on them?—I thought it was more.

189. You think they might be improved?—I dare say they might; they are better than the Dalkey roads at any rate.

190. They are better than Dalkey?—Certainly.

191. Well, there is a difference of opinion as to that. Do you not go down the Dalkey roads very often?—Yes, every day.

192. Don't you know that there are a great many of the ratepayers of Killiney who make use of the Dalkey railway station?—I have a car up and down every day, for I cannot walk it. It costs me 2s a day, £1 each way. I dare say it costs me £30 a year in consequence of the scandalous state in which the Dalkey Township Commissioners have the road. I also cannot walk it on account of the want of light. It is dangerous for anyone to walk up above on a winter evening after three or four o'clock, and I think with such management as that you cannot expect that we should wish to be added to it.

193. Do you say that the pathway from your gate to the Dalkey station is the worst portion?—Yes, from the scandalous way in which it was repaired—that was by taking the stod from the road, and putting it on the pathway.

194. Is it your opinion that Killiney and Dalkey should be kept separate?—Yes.

195. And you are satisfied with sanitary matters as they are in the Killiney township?—That has nothing to say to Dalkey, I don't say that.

Mr. Hugh O'NEILL, examined.

196. CHAIRMAN.—You are the Town Clerk of Dalkey?—I am.

197. And have filled that post for some time?—Yes.

198. What is the valuation of the district which at present cannot get the benefit of the water?—About £300.

199. Mr. Cotton.—Do you know the size of it?—No, I could only make a guess at it.

200. Do you know the number of people?—About 500 people. They are very small valuations.

201. CHAIRMAN.—Are they all ratepayers?—Yes, but they are very small ratings.

202. Are they voters here?—Some are, and some are not. There are five or six large houses, and the rest is cabin property. I am talking now only of those who have no water.

203. How many houses are there that cannot get the water?—I have already mentioned.

204. How many houses are partially supplied?—About ten, but those are large houses.

205. What is the debt at present on Dalkey?—That on the Improvement rate is £2,000.

206. Whom is that borrowed from?—The Provident Clerks Assurance Society.

207. When was it borrowed?—The 21st August, 1877.

208. What are the sinking fund instalments?—It is on the annuity system, we have not any sinking fund. We pay it in thirty equal payments of £130 3s. 2d. for principal and interest. There is another loan mixed up with that. There is one of £2,000 for the Pier and Harbour Loan also payable by thirty equal payments of £130 3s. 2d. for principal and interest, and there is also the Water Loan of £3,500, payable by 30 equal payments of £163 16s. 8d.

209. Do these payments run to the same dates?—Yes, and expire on the same dates. They were all taken at the same time.

210. Then your loans are £6,500, for the whole of which you have to pay £423 3s. for thirty years—interest and principal?—Yes.

211. How many of those instalments have you paid off?—Only one.

212. Then your debt is about £6,100?—Yes, so far as these loans are concerned.

213. What else do you owe?—We owe £1,841 to the Commissioners of Public Works—that is all we have taken up.

214. Mr. Cotton.—On what terms?—3*s* per cent., and to pay one-sixteenth part twice each year for thirty years of the principal.

215. What does that amount to?—It will vary in each case, because we pay only according to the amount borrowed.

216. When was it borrowed?—On the 26th of October, 1877—both on the same date. There are two loans in this, but they are both part of the sanitary loan of £6,900—£1,000 only being taken up; but then we have a separate one of £841, a balance due for water, that is how we owe £1,841, but when we take up the £5,000 then we will owe no more.

217. I do not understand you—I want to get at the amount sanctioned, and the amount taken up?—£4,841 is the amount sanctioned in the two loans, and £1,841 is the amount taken up.

218. CHAIRMAN.—How do you pay that?—One-sixteenth part twice each year, and 3*s* per cent. interest on it.

219. That makes altogether £5,541 1*s*?—Yes, we paid £61 7*s*. 4*d*. principal, and £98 3*s*. for interest up to the 31st December last.

220. CHAIRMAN.—Are there any other debts?—These are all the debts.

221. Are the rates the security for these loans?—Yes, the last rate I spoke about.

222. What are the component parts of last year's

3a. 7d. note t.—The improvement rate was ls. 10*½*d., including burial rate, $\frac{1}{4}$ d., and the sinking fund was a special rate of $\frac{3}{4}$ d.

223. Under what section of the Act is that?—Section 51. The water rate was 6d.; the sewer rate, 7d.; that makes up the 3s. 7d.

224. What becomes of the 6d. compensation to the Grand Jury?—That and the bridge tax are included in the improvement rate.

225. Are you sure that is included?—That includes every charge on the township. It is out of the improvement rate we pay the Grand Jury, and all the rates, the police and bridge tax, and anything of that sort.

226. Tell us what it includes?—The Grand Jury, 6d.; the police tax, 8d.; you must understand that the police tax, 8d., is charged upon the occupier.

Mr. PARKINSON, RE-EXAMINED.

223. CHAIRMAN.—While you have been out of the room we have been asking about the Grand Jury charges, and we find that they vary in amount!—We compound from year to year, but they never go beyond 6d.

Examination of Mr. O'NEILL resumed.

Mr. PARKINSON.

Mr. O'NEILL.

225. CHAIRMAN.—Is that the cause of your debt?—Yes.

226. When was your last audit?—On the 31st of December, 1878, by Mr. Finlay.

227. What balance was there then?—A nett balance in the hands of the Treasurer to the Commissioners of £215 5s. 6d.

228. To that date?—Yes.

229. Are your finances in a sound and good state now?—Yes. I have made a calculation as to how the Commissioners stand, they are not in any debt at all.

230. Is there any prospective debt?—Yes. I have put down the sums due to the Commissioners, and those owed by them, and I have struck a balance.

231. Mr. Parkinson.—You are aware of the proposed amalgamation of Dulkey with Killinney—are you not aware that it would be more to the advantage of Killinney than Dulkey?—I think it would.

232. Mr. CORROK.—What is the advantage to Dulkey?—The water would be one of the principal advantages.

233. To the small portion that has been alluded to?—Yes, we never can supply them. It is by Act of Parliament we are supplied, and we get their water from Stillorgan, and that will only throw water 250 feet, whereas those people are 300 or 310 feet above the level. The water passes by the road to Killinney, and I think it is quite sufficient to give us the supply we want.

234. Is there anything to prevent the Corporation making an agreement with you to give that supply?—No; but it is because the Killinney Commissioners own the pipes. If they agreed to lease us their pipes we would be all right.

235. Did you ever ask them?—No; to bring the water from Rathdrum would be too expensive.

236. Mr. Parkinson.—Are there any ratepayers in Killinney that use that water?—I think not. It goes across the village now.

237. If the two townships were amalgamated would that grievance be done away with?—Yes, because they would be one township, and they could get what they liked, because they would own the pipes themselves. With a very small outlay they could send the pipes on, and the pipes being sufficiently large it would rise to the one height, especially if you did not allow the people in the low ground to touch it. They are supplied in two ways in Killinney—along Ballincollig-road, and another way.

237. Then there is a further taxation upon the rate payers of 8d. —Certainly, that is the police tax.

238. And the bridge tax, and the poor rate?—Yes.

239. What is the ls. 10*½*d. comprised of?—Well, I have not the account paid to the Grand Jury—it varies every year.

240. But included in the ls. 10*½*d. t.—We pay a bulk sum.

241. What does the ls. 10*½*d. consist of?—The Grand Jury ask from us a bulk sum. The first moiety to the Grand Jury was £130 11s. 9d., and the second the same, which made for the year £161 2s. 6d. That was paid out of that ls. 10*½*d.

242. Mr. CORROK.—Mr. Parkinson stated to us that there was a composition paid to the Grand Jury of 6d. in the pound!—I know nothing about that. The Grand Jury ask us every year for a certain amount.

—DAILEY.
Sept 24, 1878.
Mr. Hugh
O'Neill.

234. Mr. O'Neill says you pay whatever they charge?—Yes, but the amount never increases beyond what I have stated.

243. What do you mean by saying that the people of the lower district would not be allowed to touch it?—They would have no necessity to touch it, because they are supplied on the other side of Killinney by a different road. There would be no necessity to touch it. If the people I mean were not allowed to touch it, you could supply the whole town of Dulkey.

244. Is the sanitary inspection of this township carried on with vigour?—It is, sir; there is a police sergeant employed.

245. Is he under the control of the Commissioners of Police?—Yes.

246. CHAIRMAN.—Do you know the entire amount paid in the town for scavenging, last year?—£29 17s. 7d.

247. What was the amount paid last year for the roads?—The roads cost for repairs, £591 11s., and horse hire, scavenging, and water carts to £80 1s. 1d.

248. Can you tell me what was the reason of the enormous difference between that and the year before?—I suppose the work must have been done better. The whole of the roads cost £591 11s. 1d., and £434 16s. 1d. the year before, and we did more last year than the year before—put down paving, &c.

249. Did you hear what Mr. Warren said as to there not being a light on a road he named for £1,600 and odd yards?—There is no house on that road at all.

250. No matter; is it not a road?—What Mr. Warren stated was perfectly right; but there is no house but one.

251. Does Mr. Finn live on that road?—Not on that road.

252. Mr. CORROK.—Don't Mr. Finn and Mr. Warren use that Dulkey-road going to and from their houses?—Yes.

253. CHAIRMAN.—Is not that their straight course? Is it not the fact that several influential residents of the neighbourhood drive up there?—Yes, it is.

254. Did you hear Mr. Warren say that he applied over and over again to the Commissioners to have that road put in proper order?—He never applied to my time—three years ago, he never made application to the Commissioners as a body.

255. Did you hear him say that the footway was totally neglected, and the road full of rats, and that the only way it was repaired was by taking the scrappings off the road, and putting them on the footway?—I heard that, but the fact was, we were making a new footpath, and that caused Mr. Warren

DARRELL,
JY-48, 1878
Mr. O'NEILL

to consider that we put the scrapings of the road upon it. In order to rise the footway we had to bring in stuff off the road on to the footway—we have raised the footway several feet, and it was really filling stuff to make a new footpath that we used.

283. How much do you owe the Alliance Gas Company?—£135 10s.

284. Up to what time?—Up to the 31st of December last.

285. Mr. Parkinson.—Is it not because we have so far forcing in not pressing the people to pay the rates?—Yes.

286. CHAIRMAN.—You actually paid for the year?—Yes, but we owe them £135 still, up to the 31st December last.

286. How much is your gas bill in the year?—It is about £70.

286. Then you owe them for over two years lighting?—We do.

287. Do they charge you any interest?—No.

288. And last year you paid them for two years in one year?—Yes, and we paid the Corporation two years for water as well.

289. How much do you owe the Corporation for water?—2474 12s. 11d. for water and excess water. The 1st rate.

290. Mr. Parkinson.—Is the difficulty in getting the rates?—Yes, but with that the Commissioners owe nothing. Their means are able to meet all these things.

291. CHAIRMAN.—You paid the Corporation £474 you owed them for water?—Yes, we paid them two years.

292. And you owe them two years still?—Yes.

293. In other words you owe them £474 12s. 11d.—that is £630 2s. 11d. on those two debts?—Yes.

294. Do you owe any others?—We owe Mr. Simpson £147 7s. 4d. for water meter; we owe Thomas and Charles Martin for bricks, stones, &c., £18 12s. 10d.; we owe Thomas Dockrell and Sons, for new names of the roads and streets of the township, £15 15s.; we owe the bank an overdraft of £310 10s. on one account. That is only on No. 1 account against an ample amount in our favour on another account, and one account balances the other. We owe Mr. Strong for gully-traps, £23 2s. 6d., we owe Mr. J. Dafford for printing maps, &c., of the main drainage, £2 12s. 6d., and that makes the total debts of the Commissioners, £1,148 17s. 11d.; and then to their credit they have a net balance of £394 9s. 1d.

295. Are these all the current accounts you owe?—Yes.

296. And what was the rate of last year as calculated?—I calculate that the recoverable rates will amount to £500—the books would show more than that. The recoverable arrears are about £500.

297. Mr. COTTON.—And how much are irrecoverable rates?—About £150.

298. CHAIRMAN.—That leaves you then in this position—that suppose you were to clear up everything to the last day of the financial year with the rate applicable, you would still be £648 17s. 11d. to the bad?—No, you have not heard me out yet. As water contractors for excess water—with an agreement signed—there is £65 due to us.

299. Is that recoverable?—Yes. We did not ask for it. The road staff when sold will bring us £7 17s. 9d.

300. Do you keep accounts of things of this kind?—Yes, I sell it.

301. And do not ask for the money for some time?—Yes. Then I claim £300 on roads paid away; because our estimate—if you look, it is a contract from the 1st of January to the 31st of December—in the estimate you will see that with these rates we met the indemnity. On the 31st of December when we spent £300, we gave the ratepayers credit, so that we are entitled to credit now, to find out how the Commissioners stand.

302. Why should you do that, because it is charged

in this account before me?—That account only goes up to the 31st of December.

303. That is the end of the financial year?—Yes. We have then, if you take that as a balance, £200 to our credit in our books.

304. Why did you make it £500?—I brought it up to this date.

305. How much money did they owe on the 1st of January?—They owed nothing.

306. But if what you have stated is right they must have owed something. On the 1st of January there was £975 10s. due at rates of rates?—Yes.

307. How much did you estimate as irrecoverable?—I struck off £150.

308. On No. 1 account there is £174 5s. 7d. of an overdraft?—Yes; and £736 16s. 4d. on our credit on No. 2 account. There are three rates running into one account, and the severage rate runs into the other account. We keep a separate account for the sewer rates, and for the other three rates we do not keep any separate account in the Bank.

309. And what is the balance?—£736 16s. 4d. was to the credit of the Commissioners at that date.

310. And besides that you had arrears of rates?—Yes.

311. And that £700 odd is a balance coming to you on foot of sewer rate alone?—Yes; and money borrowed.

312. And do you go so far as to say that the Bank has £700 odd to your credit?—Taking the whole together, I can say that the Commissioners do not owe anything—that is, they are able to pay their way. They owe something, but there are rates recoverable.

313. Mr. CORNELL.—They say the Commissioners were owed more than they owed themselves on the 1st of January?—Yes.

314. CHAIRMAN.—Are things likely to be the same next year?—No. We are going to make it a 10d. rate. We have permission to borrow £5,000 for internal drainage.

315. See you get in one lump last year £450?—Yes.

316. You won't get that £450 this year?—Yes. We were at one time in debt, but we got out of debt. We were entitled to borrow £4,841—£4,000 for sewers, and £800 for water. We took up £1,000 out of the £4,000, and the £841 leaves the balance due at that time, and we have a right to get £3,000 out of that. This year the Commissioners are going to ask for £3,000 more.

317. Not for main drainage?—No, for internal drainage. A 10d. rate added to the 7d. will make the sewer rate 10d. That will be the amount of the sewer rate, and the sum the Commissioners will owe when they take up that will be £7,841, and the 10d. rate is to be put on for that.

318. What are the rates proposed for this year?—1s. 11d. improvement rate, 5d. water rate, 10d. sewer rate, and 8d. a special sinking rate.

319. That is 8s. 10d. altogether?—Yes.

320. Four shillings and eight pence will be the rate in Duloe exclusive of poor rate?—Yes, by including police tax 8d., and bridge tax 2d. in the pound.

321. On your estimate this year you owe two years' gas and water of which you propose to pay off one—that would leave two years still due?—That will be paid out of the £300 that is due to us.

322. Can you say, as a matter of fact, that there is any desire or otherwise on the part of the ratepayers of Duloe to have it extended?—I don't know the feeling of the ratepayers at all.

323. Have you ever heard it discussed?—It was never known that such a thing was proposed; when I got your queries I answered them from the Commissioners.

324. Has there been any talk on the subject in the township?—I have never heard a word spoken about it. I don't suppose there are ten people in the town who know that such an application is being made. The Commissioners considered the matter two or three

times, and thought it would be beneficial to both townships.

305. Mr. CORROD.—How many Commissioners are there?—Twelve.

306. Was this question of the annexation of Killiney discussed at a special meeting?—No, it was at an ordinary meeting. The resolution telling me to answer these questions was discussed at the first meeting when they received notice, and I took down what I was to say, and they stated that they wished to have the boundary extended.

307. How many Commissioners attended that meeting—I think eight or nine Commissioners were present.

308. Were they unanimous?—Yes.

309. Then on the last day there were eight Commissioners out of thirteen who confirmed the former resolution?—Yes, including Mr. Parkinson and Mr. O'Neill, and they came to the conclusion that it would be an advantage to both townships.

310. CHAIRMAN.—What advantage do you think it would be to either Killiney or Ballybennock?—I do think it would be an advantage. First, there is no sewerage at Killiney.

311. That is the very thing I asked Mr. Parkinson about—do you propose to have main drainage and to put it all over Killiney?—Oh, yes, but the people would have to pay for it.

312. That is the very thing!—The Commissioners never intended that the Killiney people should be saddled with this sewerage rate of Dalkey at all.

313. What Mr. Parkinson said was this, "I would make each district pay its own debt." You must remember that in Killiney they are not the sanitary authority, and the guardians can strike any rate they please, and can make a contributory district, and put on a rate of 1s., 2s., or 3s. in the pound, if they want

it. So far as the sewers are concerned put that out of the case!—In my calculation I put the sewers out altogether; but outside that altogether they came to the conclusion that there would be a saving.

314. What saving?—On the roads, in being able to do with one staff of men for the extended township.

315. CHAIRMAN.—Well you tell me what your salaries are?—I receive, as Town Clerk, £88, and £15 as Executive Sanitary Officer. The engineer has £25 a year. The water inspector has £15, and the collector is paid generally £6 in the pound.

316. There would be no economy as far as he is concerned?—No, because the more money he would collect the more pounds he would get. As far as the sanitary offices are concerned, however, one sanitary officer could do the whole, and there would be scarcely work enough for him in the two townships, and what the Commissioners here propose to do is to get one good young official who could collect the rates and do the business of the sanitary officer as well, and to have one town hall, one town clerk, and one engineer.

317. How much would you propose to pay the engineer?—I don't know.

318. If you don't know what he is to be paid how can you say that there would be economy?—I think there would be economy.

319. Economy is the difference between money paid and money saved!—Well, I think there would be economy.

320. You cannot ask Mr. Walsh to manage the roads in Killiney as well for the £25 a year!—It is quite plain that one authority could work cheaper for the two places.

321. What do the two authorities pay now?—I cannot say; I have no means of finding that out.

MR. RICHARD W. WALSH, examined.

Mr. Richard
W. Walsh

322. CHAIRMAN.—You are the engineer of the township?—Yes. Mr. Parkinson has told you about the boundaries being published in the *Gazette*. The *Gazette* notice of the 28th of March, 1885, sets out the boundaries of Kingstown. Dalkey was formed into a township in 1852, and all the boundaries are described, as required by the Act of 1854, and published in the *Gazette* in 1863. In this *Gazette* it is not very clearly defined as to where the boundaries commence or where they end; so I then went to the *Gazette* notice at the time that Kingstown was formed into a township, and I found it dated the 2nd of March, 1856, at page 398. At that date Dalkey was part of the County Dublin, and therefore Kingstown had to maintain the whole of the boundary roads of the township. That was the arrangement made with all the townships in the country—that when they were formed into townships they were obliged to maintain the boundary roads, and Kingstown did maintain its boundary road. Mr. Doyle's map shows the whole of the Castle Park-road as being in the township of Kingstown. He has got a sewer coming out there and we have tried to prevent him, because we consider that the centre of the road was the boundary, and what we state now is, that if we tried to bring that piece of road there (pointing to the map) into our boundary we would have to do away with this nuisance caused by the sewer.

323. Are you going to ask us to alter the boundary there now?—No; we are afraid that Kingstown will ask you to alter it. We want you to fix in the map that the original boundary shall still be maintained.

324. Do you want to have no difference made in the boundary there?—At present we maintain this road up to the railway bridge.

325. Do the Kingstown people maintain Castle Park-road up to the railway bridge?—Yes.

326. Does the boundary of the township run up to the centre of Castle Park-road?—It is a constant

source of litigation and trouble who owns the road. We simply maintain the road, and we are not obliged to sever it. By private arrangement the Kingstown people maintain it as far as the railway bridge. We maintain the Castle Park-road beyond that.

327. Beyond the railway bridge you maintain it?—Yes; up to the Barnaulgate—up to the Killiney-road. I think if we could get Ballybennock into our boundary it would be a source of advantage, as we have got by-laws compelling businesses to bring a fine over and back for a certain sum. With reference to the annexation of Dalkey to Killiney, and as indicating that the former has increased, a comparison with other townships will not be out of place. From such it will be seen that, as far as Cooters is concerned, the houses in Cooters are 620, in Dalkey 631, and in Killiney only 357, showing that the houses there are very small in number. That is from the census of 1871. It will be seen that Dalkey is the second smallest in that, and Killiney and Ballybennock is the smallest.

328. Are you aware that of the townships in Ireland there are a considerable number smaller than Dalkey?—Yes.

329. Do you think that Dalkey is now too small to stand by itself?—We don't consider that.

330. When you talk about the repairs of the roads have you considered what it would cost you if you brought in Killiney?—It would be more economical, I think, to manage the two townships as we would have the same set of officers.

331. What officers have they in Killiney?—The Poor Law Union have one set of officers, and the Commissioners another.

332. Do you know anything about the salaries?—The water Inspector gets £60 a year. That would do us, and we pay one man as a water Inspector £15 a year, and he has not enough to do—neither has the man in Killiney enough to do, and there would be

DALKEY.
APR 16, 1892.
MR. O'NEILL.

BALTIMORE,
April 24, 1908.
Mr. Richard
W. Walsh.

a saving. One ganger would do to look after all the men, and the same stable would do; and if we had a common feed we could have a fire engine.

333. Do you mean to say that the adding of Killiney would put you in the position that you would have a fire brigade, and a fire engine that you cannot have now?—Yes, we cannot have one of these things now, because we cannot afford it. I think that the builders are going on to Bray, because we cannot open up the roads.

334. Mr. CORCORAN.—What you want us to do is to define the boundaries so that there will be no dispute?—Yes.

335. How do you manage the roads where the County Grand Jury is over them?—We are obliged to maintain the whole of that road (pointing to map).

336. Do you get any contribution from the Grand Jury?—None whatever.

337. Why do you maintain it?—I believe that under the Act, townships are obliged to maintain the boundary roads.

338. I would like to know that very much, because it affects all townships!—I know that they have to do it both in Inchicore and Fingal. At any rate, as a matter of fact, we maintain the entire of the Killiney-road, and all the building stones and bricks go up along that road. From that point (referring to map) to this is the heaviest road in the town to maintain. We are getting on, financially; we are able to spend more money on roads, and more money on getting kerb stones, paving, &c.

The inquiry then closed.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX No. 1.—(Page 3.)

CITY OF DUBLIN.

ABSTRACT of the Valuation of the several Wards comprised in the NORTH CITY ELECTORAL DIVISION.

	Area, Statute Measure	Annual Valuation, &c., of Property liable to Assessment.					
		Land.	Buildings.	Half Annual Rent.	Total		
Arsenal Quay, 489 2 5	£ 571 15 0	£ 23,016 5 0	£ 354 0 0*	£ 36,562 0 0		
Inns Quay, 190 2 4	£ 89 0 0	£ 38,618 15 0	£ 692 0 0*	£ 39,390 15 0		
Mortuary, 212 2 1	£ 133 0 0	£ 37,481 15 0	£ 356 10 0*	£ 38,837 5 0		
North City, 110 2 12	—	£ 41,269 0 0	£ 434 10 0*	£ 42,043 10 0		
North Dock, 652 0 21	£ 258 15 0	£ 58,609 0 0	£ 4,360 15 0*	£ 63,207 10 0		
Rotunda, 193 3 25	£ 26 0 0	£ 38,617 5 0	£ 259 15 0*	£ 39,913 0 0		
Gas Mains,	...	—	—	—	£ 1,566 0 0	£ 1,566 0 0	
Water Mains,	...	—	—	—	£ 4,244 0 0	£ 4,244 0 0	
Trafficways,	...	—	—	—	£ 741 0 0	£ 741 0 0	
Telegraph,	...	—	—	—	£ 14 0 0	£ 14 0 0	
Total, ...	£ 1,789 2 28	£ 1,069 10 0	£ 247,331 0 0	£ 13,022 10 0	£ 269,353 0 0		

ABSTRACT of the Valuation of the several Wards comprised in the SOUTH CITY ELECTORAL DIVISION.

	Area, Statute Measure	£	£	£	£	£	£
		s.	p.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Blitzwilliam, 199 3 9	£ 177 10 0	£ 44,618 0 0	£ 551 0 0*	£ 45,347 0 0		
Mansion House, 113 1 39	£ 23 0 0	£ 33,127 10 0	£ 373 0 0*	£ 33,700 15 0		
Merchants' Quay, 386 0 37	£ 267 0 0	£ 25,521 10 0	£ 458 5 0*	£ 26,380 15 0		
Royal Exchange, 70 3 23	—	£ 43,266 10 0	£ 364 10 0*	£ 44,330 0 0		
South City, 56 0 12	—	£ 40,501 10 0	£ 620 5 0*	£ 40,531 15 0		
South Dock, 260 1 34	£ 31 0 0	£ 47,005 0 0	£ 2,441 10 0*	£ 49,475 10 0		
Trinity, 120 0 2	£ 206 0 0	£ 43,693 10 0	£ 1,327 0 0*	£ 45,020 10 0		
Usher's Quay, 527 2 39	£ 694 0 0	£ 37,294 15 0	£ 453 5 0*	£ 38,612 0 0		
Wood Quay, 154 0 34	£ 39 0 0	£ 33,043 10 0	£ 320 0 0*	£ 33,364 10 0		
Gas Mains,	...	—	—	—	£ 2,145 0 0	£ 2,145 0 0	
Water Mains,	...	—	—	—	£ 6,939 0 0	£ 6,939 0 0	
Trafficways,	...	—	—	—	£ 2,829 15 0	£ 2,979 15 0	
Telegraph,	...	—	—	—	£ 17 10 0	£ 17 10 0	
Total, ...	£ 1,864 2 20	£ 1,451 10 0	£ 335,073 15 0	£ 18,441 0 0	£ 377,894 5 0		

Dated at the General Valuation Office, Dublin,
this 10th day of December, 1878.

(Signed),

J. HALL GREENE,
Commissioner of Valuation.

APPENDIX No. 2.—(Page 6.)

COUNTY OF DUBLIN.

RETURN showing the Area and Valuation of the DUBLIN TOWNSHIPS.

Towships	Area.	Valuation.	
		£	s. d.
DUBLIN, 3,503	£ 66,000	0 0
KATHARINE, 1,023	£ 66,063	0 0
PENRIGUE, 1,621	£ 64,268	0 0
ERLHAMSHAM, 280	£ 8,811	0 0
CLOSTERS, 1,233	£ 14,256	0 0

RETURN showing the Area and Valuation of the DUBLIN TOWNSHIPS—continued.

	Area	Estimate Annual Valuation.					
		Land		Buildings		Total	
	A.	D.	P.	S.	£	s.	d.
TOWNSHIPS OF DROICHEADA, CLOTHLAW, AND GLASNEVIN—							
Glasnevin Demense (parish of Finglas),	...	5	0	6	4	15	0
Glasnevin Demense (parish of Glasnevin),	...	42	1	6	104	0	0
Glasnevin,	53	1	4	132	0	0
Bankfarm,	...	45	2	13	112	0	0
Droichead (parish of Clontarf),	...	188	1	16	438	15	0
Dromcondra,	...	103	2	10	218	5	0
Goosagram (part of),	...	7	2	20	20	0	0
Bridgeman,	...	110	0	22	285	0	0
Clinchite, East (part of),	...	110	2	25	309	0	0
Do., West (part of),	...	63	3	3	158	15	0
Gosgrave,	...	3	2	2	6	10	0
Droichead (parish of St. George),	...	18	0	38	82	0	0
Fairfield,	...	7	2	1	24	10	0
Dawsonhill,	...	9	0	4	28	10	0
Greenmount,	...	8	2	12	23	5	0
Prospect,	...	9	2	20	27	15	0
Dawsonhill or Crosgate, North (part of),	...	78	1	28	291	5	0
Crosgate (part of),	...	4	2	9	9	0	0
Prospect (part of),	...	24	0	8	60	10	0
Slatford or Westfern (part of),	...	20	2	4	70	0	0
Total,	...	919	0	23	2,538	15	0
DOLPHIN'S BAY DISTRICT—							
Dolphin's Bay (part of),	...	128	3	38	292	15	0
GRANGEGERMAN DISTRICT—							
Grangegerman, Middle (part of),	...	160	2	14	424	5	0
Caber,	...	24	1	11	64	15	0
Grangegerman, South,	...	120	3	23	369	0	0
Total,	...	304	3	13	817	0	0
TERENURE DISTRICT—							
Terenure (part of),	...	943	2	11	627	0	0
MILDTOWN DISTRICT—							
Mildtown,	...	183	0	37	481	15	0
ROBBINS, PRIESTHOLE, &c., DISTRICTS—							
Farmhely (part of),	...	78	0	16	220	5	0
Easbuck (part of),	...	813	0	28	1,427	10	0
Simmencourt,	...	92	2	15	259	15	0
Priesthole,	...	277	3	36	839	10	0
Trimlesion or Owentown,	...	75	0	38	215	5	0
Mooneacarrow or Collyer (part of),	...	70	3	39	210	0	0
Total,	...	1,104	0	13	3,185	5	0
					3,967	15	0
					7,138	10	0

General Valuation Office, Dublin, 20th November, 1878.

APPENDIX No. 3.—(Page 6.)

VALUATION OF WARDS.

Abstract of Total	Value of Property Table for Improvement Rate	Value of Property Table for Gutter Rate.
North Side, ...	£ s. d. 268,739 15 0	£ s. d. 254,223 5 0
South Side, ...	251,961 0 0	265,002 0 0
	620,700 15 0	620,421 5 0
An amount (£1,825 2s.) charged on measurement as per Bill of Lading furnished by the Corporation, and representing at 2s. in the pound a valuation of, ...	18,220 0 0	—
Total, ...	620,926 15 0	—

VALUATION OF WARDS—continued.

Name of Ward.	Value of Lands.	Value of Buildings.	Value of Buildings and other Premiums wholly intended to B.M.Y. Excess per Valuation Return.	Half Rateable D.	Total.
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
NORTH SIDE:					
Arms Quay, ...	371 15 0	33,040 0 0	400 0 0	497 15 0	34,642 0 0
Inn Quay, ...	86 0 0	38,629 0 0	—	611 10 0	39,200 10 0
Moorings, ...	123 0 0	37,591 10 0	43 0 0	393 10 0	38,051 5 0
North City, ...	—	41,389 0 0	7 0 0	447 10 0	42,043 10 0
North Dock, ...	256 15 0	58,908 0 0	3,381 0 0	3,659 15 0	62,507 10 0
Rotunda, ...	26 0 0	35,617 5 0	41 0 0	228 15 0	36,813 0 0
Gas Mains, ...	—	—	1,560 0 0	—	1,560 0 0
Water Mains, ...	—	—	4,244 0 0	—	4,244 0 0
Tramways, ...	—	—	741 0 0	—	741 0 0
Telegraphs, ...	—	—	14 0 0	—	14 0 0
Total, ...	1,038 10 0	247,921 10 0	16,395 5 0	3,238 15 0	262,623 0 0
Deduct value of Property exempted from Improvement Rate, ...					13,863 5 0
Total amount liable for Improvement Rate, ...					248,759 15 0
Gross amount of Valuation as above,					262,623 0 0
Deduct property exempted from Sewer Rate, ...					8,933 15 0
Total amount liable for Sewer Rate, ...					254,690 5 0
SOUTH SIDE:					
Pitmeadow, ...	177 10 0	44,618 0 0	312 10 0	238 5 0	45,547 5 0
Mansion House, ...	29 0 0	33,197 10 0	8 0 0	265 5 0	33,729 15 0
Merchants' Quay, ...	317 0 0	22,851 10 0	4 0 0	654 5 0	22,956 15 0
Royal Exchange, ...	—	43,028 10 0	12 10 0	352 0 0	43,223 0 0
South City, ...	—	45,201 10 0	1 0 0	669 5 0	45,831 15 0
South Dock, ...	31 0 0	47,008 0 0	2,114 0 0	527 10 0	49,475 10 0
Trinity, ...	800 0 0	45,890 10 0	590 0 0	645 15 0	45,338 10 0
Under's Quay, ...	694 0 0	37,284 10 0	45 5 0	418 0 0	37,412 0 0
Wood Quay, ...	93 0 0	33,545 10 0	84 0 0	520 0 0	33,958 10 0
Gas Mains, ...	—	—	2,145 0 0	—	2,145 0 0
Water Mains, ...	—	—	6,859 0 0	—	6,859 0 0
Tramways, ...	—	—	9,979 10 0	—	9,979 10 0
Telegraphs, ...	—	—	17 10 0	—	17 10 0
Total, ...	1,401 10 0	335,003 15 0	14,575 15 0	3,867 5 0	377,896 0 0
Deduct value of Property exempted from Improvement Rate, ...					21,933 5 0
Total amount liable for Improvement Rate, ...					355,964 0 0
Gross amount of Valuation as above,					377,896 5 0
Deduct value of Property exempted from Sewer Rate, ...					11,934 5 0
Total amount liable for Sewer Rate, ...					365,962 0 0

Description of Property exempt from Improvement and Sewer Rates	Valuation, except from Improvement Rate.	Valuation, except from Sewer Rate	Description of Property exempt from Improvement and Sewer Rates	Valuation, except from Improvement Rate	Valuation, except from Sewer Rate
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.		£ s. d.	£ s. d.
NORTH SIDE:					
Half Annual Rent, ...	3,238 15 0	3,238 15 0	SOUTH SIDE—continued.		
Corporation Property, ...	4,853 0 0	4,853 0 0	Bank of Ireland, ...	3,800 0 0	—
Public Markets, ...	365 0 0	—	School of Medicine (Catholic University), ...	55 0 0	—
Apothecaries' Hall, ...	130 0 0	—	Canal Dock, Hanover-quay, ...	300 0 0	—
Port and Docks Board, ...	5,254 10 0	—	Corn Exchange, ...	350 0 0	—
Total, ...	13,863 5 0	8,093 15 0	Theatre, ...	470 0 0	—
SOUTH SIDE:			Battersea, Spitalfields, ...	90 0 0	—
Half Annual Rent, ...	2,867 5 0	2,867 5 0	Total, ...	23,000 5 0	11,934 5 0
Corporation Property, ...	8,067 0 0	8,067 0 0			
Trinity College, ...	6,130 0 0	—	Gross Totals for North and South Sides, ...	37,818 10 0	30,038 0 0
Port and Docks, ...	350 0 0	—			
College of Surgeons, ...	600 0 0	—			

APPENDIX No. 4.—(Page 7.)

BOROUGH OF DUBLIN.

CONSOLIDATED RATES.

Municipal	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881
s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.	s. d.
North Side—						
Improvement Rate, ...	9 0	9 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0
Sewer Rate, ...	0 3½	0 3½	0 4	0 4	0 4	0 4
Domestic Water Rate, ...	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
Public Water Rate, ...	0 3	0 3	0 3	0 3	0 3	0 3
Grand Jury Rate, ...	2 2	2 2	1 10	2 0	1 4	0 3
Main Draining Rate, ...	0 2	—	—	—	—	—
Burial Rate, ...	0 0½	—	—	—	—	—
Vestry Cess Abolition Rate, ...	—	—	0 1	—	—	0 1
Total Municipal Rates, ...	5 11	5 7	5 6	5 7	5 11	5 6
Poors Rate, ...	2 4	2 4	2 0	2 0	2 4	2 0
Police Tax, ...	0 8	0 8	0 8	0 8	0 8	0 8
Bridge Tax, ...	0 2	—	—	—	0 1	0 0
Total in £, ...	9 1	9 1	8 8	8 8	8 8	7 6
South Side—						
Improvement Rate, ...	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 0	2 4
Sewer Rate, ...	0 3½	0 3½	0 4	0 4	0 4	0 2
Domestic Water Rate, ...	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0	1 0
Public Water Rate, ...	0 3	0 3	0 3	0 3	0 3	0 3
Grand Jury Rate, ...	2 2	2 2	1 10	2 0	1 4	0 3
Main Draining Rate, ...	0 2	—	—	—	—	—
Burial Rate, ...	0 0½	—	—	—	—	—
Vestry Cess Abolition Rate, ...	—	—	0 1	—	—	0 1
Total Municipal Rates, ...	5 11	5 7	5 6	5 7	5 11	5 6
Poors Rate, ...	1 10	1 10	1 10	1 10	2 2	2 4
Police Tax, ...	0 8	0 8	0 8	0 8	0 8	0 8
Bridge Tax, ...	0 2	—	—	—	—	0 0
Total in £, ...	9 7	9 1	8 0	8 1	7 9	7 5

January 16th, 1879.

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 5.—(Page 28.)

EXTRACT from the Order of the PRIVY COUNCIL of IRELAND relating to the DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE DISTRICT, taken from the DUBLIN GAZETTE, Friday, May 3, 1850.

Now we, the Lord Lieutenant and Council of Ireland, in pursuance of the powers vested in Us for that purpose, under and by virtue of the said rectified Act, do hereby order and direct that from and after the 13th day of May in this present year of our Lord, 1850, the Police District of Dublin Metropolis shall be divided into the three divisions or districts following, that is to say—the Castle and Kingstown, or letter A Division; the B, or College Division; and the C, Roxanda Division; and that the limits of said respective divisions shall thenceforth stand and be as

follows, that is to say—that the Castle and Kingstown, or letter A Division, shall consist of and have the bounds following, that is to say—from a point in the central line of the River Anna Liffey opposite to the centre of Eustace-street, in a direct line to the centre of the north end of the said Rustans-street, and from thence along the central line of the said street, and from thence in a direct line to the centre of the north end of Great George's-street, South, and from thence along the central line of Great George's-street, South, and so on to and along the central line and

lines of Aungier-street, Redmond's-hill, Kevin's-port, alias Dale-street, alias Wexford-street, Camdav-street, Portobello, and so on along the central line of the road to the centre of Leinster-bridge, and so on and along the central line of the road leading from Leinster-bridge through Rathmines to the by-road adjoining Wilson's Woolen cloth mills and leading to the River Dodder, and along the central line of the said by-road and the left bank of the River Dodder to the junction of the baronies of Upper-cross and Newcastle, near Cypress Grove, and thence along the boundary line between the baronies of Newcastle and Upper-cross to the third lock from Dublin, on the Grand Canal near Golden-bridge; thence in a direct line to the bridge over the River Anna Liffey and Chapelizod, and from the point in the central line of the River Anna Liffey opposite the central line of Eastgate-street; up and along the central line of the said river to the extreme limits of the district of Chapelizod; and that the said division shall also comprise and consist of the several places situate within the bounds or limits following:—From the left bank of the River Dodder one furlong statute measure, from the right of the bridge of Donnybrook running two furlongs statute measure to the right of the line of road from Dublin to the sea shore at Killiney, by the line of road more particularly defined as follows:—From the bridge over the Dodder at Donnybrook, along the line of road leading through the village of Stillorgan, by Galloping-green, to Foxrock, thence by the cross road of Dux's Grange to the Kil-o'-the-Grange; from the Kill-o'-the-Grange by the Booterstown-road, and the Glasney or Sallinsaggan's-road to Miner's-hill, thence by Bearville, Anglesea and Coalmeen-road towards Killiney Castle, and by the said road to the gate of Mountmalus, thence by the southern wall of said Mount, or Killiney-hill to the nearest point of the low water mark of the sea shore to said southern wall, thence by the low water mark of said shore, via Bull's-neck, including the harbour of Kingstown, till it joins the boundary of the B, or College Division, at the lighthouse at the termination of the South-wall, and that the boundary from the bridge over the Dodder at Donnybrook by the line of road above defined, shall be held to include the full breadth of said road and two furlongs statute measure to the right or exterior of said road, and which furlongs shall be to all intents and purposes part of said Police District, and subject to the like rates and assessments as any part of the said district is or shall be liable, and that the whole of said places so named and defined as aforesaid shall form one division, to be called the A, or Castle and Kingstown Division as aforesaid, and that three of the Justices of the Police District of Dublin metropolis shall attend and preside within said Division for the despatch of public business, and that two public offices shall be held therein for the despatch of such criminal and other business as may be cognizable and determinable therein; one of said public offices to be held at Exchange-court, in the city of Dublin, and the other of said offices to be held in the town of Kingstown, in said district and division.

That the B, or College Division, shall consist of and have the bounds or limits following, that is to say—from the lighthouse at the termination of the South-wall, and thence by the low-water mark to the sea beach, opposite to the point where the barony of Rathdown abuts on the road leading from Dublin to Blackrock, at Old Merrion Burying Ground, along the boundary line between said barony and the barony of Dublin, to the bridge over the Dodder at

Donnybrook, thence along the left bank of the said River Dodder to the boundary of the A, or Castle and Kingstown Division, at the by-road near Wilson's cloth mills, and the boundary of the said College Division to the west, shall be the same at the boundary of the said A, or Castle and Kingstown Division, from the said River Dodder, by the by-road aforesaid and Rathmines, as far as the point in the central line of the said River Anna Liffey, opposite to the central line of Eastgate-street, and from the said point the limits of the said B, or College Division, shall be along the central line of the said River Anna Liffey to the extreme limits of the C Division or district at the centre of the line between the lighthouse at the termination of the North-wall and the lighthouse at the termination of the South-wall, and from the centre of said line to the said lighthouse at the termination of the South-wall aforesaid, and that the whole of said places so named and defined as aforesaid shall form one division, to be called the B, or College Division, as aforesaid; and that two of the Justices of the Police district of Dublin metropolis shall attend and preside within said Division for the despatch of public business, and that one public office shall be held therein for the despatch of such criminal and other business as may be cognizable and determinable therein, at College-street, in the said city of Dublin.

That the C, or Rotunda Division, shall consist of and have the bounds or limits following, that is to say—from the centre of the line from the lighthouse at the termination of the South-wall to the lighthouse at the termination of the North-wall, up and along the central line of the River Anna Liffey to the centre of the bridge at Chapelizod, and from the said bridge along the left bank of the said river to the ferry at the bottom of Knockmaron-hill, thence along the line of road over Knockmaron-hill to the entrance of the Phoenix Park at Knockmaron-gate, thence by the wall of the Phoenix Park to Ashdown Lodge, at the back of the Under-Secretary's house, thence by the most direct road to Longfield-bridge, on the Royal Canal, thence by the most direct road to the Tolka-river, and by that river to Annside-bridge, thence by the sea line to the lighthouse on the North-wall, and from thence to the point on the centre of the line between the said lighthouse at the termination of the North-wall and the lighthouse at the termination of the South-wall, on the boundary of the B Division, and that the whole of said places so named and defined as aforesaid shall form one Division, to be called the C, or Rotunda Division, as aforesaid, and that two of the Justices of the Police district of Dublin metropolis shall attend and preside within said Division for the despatch of public business, and that one public office shall be held therein for the despatch of such criminal and other business as may be cognizable and determinable therein at Henry-street, in the said city of Dublin. And the said three Divisions are hereby set out, defined, directed, and ascertained, of which all persons concerned are hereby required to take notice.

Given at the Council Chamber in Dublin,
this 1st day of May, 1850.

MAHEREE BRADY, C.	T. B. O. SMITH.
F. BLACKSTONE.	D. R. PILOT.
FRED. SHAW.	E. KEATINGE.
RICH'D. W. GREENE.	RICHARD MOORE.
THOS. ERIONDE.	JAMES HENRY MORAN.
EDWARD MEATH.	

APPENDIX No. 6.—(Page 29.)

DEBTS DUE BY THE OLD CORPORATION OF DUBLIN ON 1st NOVEMBER, 1841.

CITY ESTATE LIABILITIES BOROUGH FUND:		£	s.	d.		£	s.	d.	
Debentures issued August, 1829, £200,000, Irish currency, equivalent in British currency to the sum of	...	190,023	1	6					
Debentures issued 6th October, 1838, British currency,	...	30,000	0	0					
		220,023	1	6					
Arrears of interest,	1,419	7	3					
Tenure debt, £50,554, raised in 1775, at 5 per cent. Amount which has been paid on account of interest or annuities thereon from November, 1841, to 12th December, 1865, the date of extinction of last life,	...	38,837	19	9					
Deferred warrants and interest thereon,	...	2,300	11	4					
Law costs,	1,688	7	11					
Debt to Paving Corporation,	...	341	10	9					
Judgment debts for which Receiver was placed over the city estate,	...	8,850	19	7					
Total charged upon city estates,	...					298,055	19	1	
PURE WATER LIABILITIES:									
Debentures issued at various dates, Irish currency £6,000, at 5 and 6 per cent., equivalent in British currency to	...	4,800	0	0					
Debentures, £100 each British currency, at 5 per cent., issued March, 1836,	67,400	0	0					
		72,200	0	0					
Arrears of interest,	306	18	7					
Debts due to Canal Companies,	...	2,979	18	10					
Sundry small debts, including law costs,	...	320	18	6					
Total charged upon pipe water,	...					78,000	18	11	
Total debt of Old Corporation, handed over to New Corporation,	...					363,834	14	0	
PAYMENTS ON ACCOUNT OF ABOVE BY THE NEW CORPORATION, AND BY THE PRESENT CORPORATION, &c.:									
BOROUGH FUND OR CITY ESTATE ACCOUNT:									
Arrears of interest which were due on city debentures,	£1,429	7	3					
Payments on account of Tenure Arrears,	...	30,837	19	9					
Law costs,	1,681	7	11					
Deferred warrants and interest,	...	2,300	11	4					
Debt to Paving Corporation,	...	341	10	9					
Judgment debts,	...	8,850	19	7					
Purchase of city debentures, Irish, equivalent in British currency to	...	592,246	3	2					
Ditto, ditto, British currency debentures,	...	6,000	0	0					
		598,946	3	9					
Total on Borough Fund account,	...					73,738	19	9	
PURE WATER ACCOUNT:									
Payment of arrears on pipe-water debentures,	£200	18	7					
Debt due to Canal Companies,	...	2,070	18	10					
Sundry small debts, law costs, &c.,	320	18	6					
		2,600	18	13					
Purchase of pipe-water debentures, Irish,	...	184	13	4					
Total on pipe-water account,					3,785	0	3	
Total amount of old debt paid off by the new and the present Corporation, up to 31st August, 1878,						70,846	8	0
Leaving due on 31st August, 1878, on account of old debt of £243,838 14s.						264,292	6	0
DEBTS TAKEN OVER BY THE PRESENT CORPORATION OF DUBLIN, UNDER THE PROVISIONS OF THE DUBLIN IMPROVEMENT ACT, 12 & 13 V.R., &c.:									
Balance due by the Wide Street Commissioners on account of loan from the Lords of the Treasury,	...	£10,023	12	0					
Balance due by same on account of loan from the National Industries Company,	...	11,010	0	0					
		21,033	12	0					
All paid off, together with interest by the present Corporation									

April 3rd, 1879.

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 7.—(Page 30.)

CORPORATION OF THE CITY OF DUBLIN.
CITY ESTATE OR BOROUGH FUND LIABILITY FOR LOANS.

	Ooriginal Loans	Repaid.	Rate of Interest.	Balance due.	Contracted
Accident City Debentures issued in year 1812.	£ 150,525 1 6	£ 22,945 2 1	Per cent. 4	£ 126,276 19 5	Debt of Old Corporation.
Ditto Ditto 1889,	30,000 0 0	6,500 0 0	4	23,500 0 0	Ditto.
Dwellings Improvement Fund, ...	12,000 0 0	2 1 0	4	12,000 19 0	28 and 30 Vic., c. 35, &c.
	233,525 1 6	29,545 4 1			
Total existing Liabilities for Loans on 3rd April, 1879.				204,774 17 5	.

IMPROVEMENT RATE OF FUND LIABILITY FOR LOANS.

	Loans under 12 & 13 Vic., c. 97, &c. 24, out of £100,000.	Repayments.	Balance due.	Rate of Interest.
Cattle Market Bonds issued to Subscribers to Cattle Market, Ditto to Michael Mandt, ...	£ 12,000 0 0	—	£ 17,000 0 0	6
Mortgage No. 119, account advance for Market, ...	600 0 0	—	600 0 0	5
Mortgage No. 233 to 234 issued to Hibernian Bank ditto, Mortgage No. ... issued to National Bank, advance for houses.	3,500 0 0	—	3,500 0 0	6½
Mortgage No. 197 to Bank of Ireland, College-green, account, Mortgage No. 235 to Law Life Assurance Society, Paving account.	3,000 0 0	—	3,000 0 0	6
Mortgage No. 236 to ditto, ditto, ...	2,000 0 0	2,000 0 0	—	5
	30,000 0 0	1,700 0 0	28,300 0 0	8
	20,000 0 0	3,000 0 0	17,000 0 0	4½
	30,000 0 0	1,200 0 0	28,800 0 0	4½
	78,000 0 0	8,000 0 0		
Total due on 3rd April, 1879, on account of the sum of £78,000 borrowed out of £100,000, 12 and 13 Vic., cap. 97, sec. 24, ...			70,320 0 0	

WATER WORKS FUND LIABILITY FOR LOANS.*

	Loans under borrowing powers Water Works Act.	Repayments.	Balance due, and also account released Mortgages.	Rate of Interest.
Advance by Public Works Loan Commissioners, ...	£ 282,000 0 0	£ 49,297 10 8	£ 211,102 9 6	6
... Economic Life Assurance Society, ...	50,000 0 0	30,000 0 0	24,000 0 0	6½
... Hand-in-Hand Insurance Company, ...	40,000 0 0	17,000 0 0	23,000 0 0	5
... Kingswear Water Company, ...	2,000 0 0	2,000 0 0	—	4½
... on issue of Mortgages Nos. 2 to 180 with Coupons, ...	35,000 0 0	—	35,000 0 0	5
... on release of Mortgages (Nos. 123 to 144), ...	£4,000 0 0	—	—	4½
... " (Nos. 165 to 178) 7,000 0 0	—	—	—	4½
... " (No. 180) 8,000 0 0	—	—	—	4½
... " (Nos. 181 to 190) 9,000 0 0	—	—	—	4½
... by Board of Works, Ireland, Mortgage No. 191, 35,400 0 0	4,100 0 0	31,270 0 0	6
... on issue of Mortgages (Nos. 193 to 203), ...	5,000 0 0	—	—	4½
... " (Nos. 206 to 213) 2,000 0 0	—	—	—	4½
... " (Nos. 214 to 217) 6,000 0 0	—	—	—	4½
... " (Nos. 218 to 225) 2,000 0 0	—	—	—	4½
... on issue of Mortgages (Nos. 226 to 239), ...	6,000 0 0	—	6,000 0 0	4½
... on release of Mortgages (Nos. 233 to 236), ...	9,000 0 0	—	—	4½
... " (Nos. 237 to 240) 2,000 0 0	—	—	—	4½
... " (No. 241) 500 0 0	—	—	—	4½
... " (Nos. 242 to 245) 2,000 0 0	—	—	63,000 0 0	4½
	332,900 0 0	90,227 10 8		
Total remaining due 3rd April, 1879, on account of £332,900, borrowed out of the sum of £332,900 authorized to be raised by Water Works Act, Amount of Pipe Water Debenture Debt contracted by the Old Corporation, and now a first charge upon City Water Rates, 24 and 25 Vic., c. 172,			302,672 9 4	
			72,012 7 8	
Total due for Losses,	374,887 17 0	

* 24 and 25 Vic. c. 172 (1841), 26 and 27 Vic. c. 17 (1855), 28 Vic. c. 10 (1846), 28 and 29 Vic. c. 20 (1870), 27 and 28 Vic. c. 21 (1874). Local Government Board, Ireland, P.O. (Dublin), G.A., 1874.

MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES COMMISSION.

EXISTING LIABILITIES for LOANS on 3RD APRIL, 1879.

Chargeable to Borough Fund City Estate,	£	s.	d.
Improvement Fund or Rate,	204,774	17	5
" Water Works Fund,	30,350	0	0
Total, ...	235,124	17	5

IMPROVEMENT FUND.

BONDS OF INDEBTEDNESS.

Lloyd's Bonds, Nos. 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 77, issued to the Linlithgow Asphalt Company at 5 per cent.,	£	s.	d.
and remaining due on 31st August, 1878,	9,320	13	4
Bond No. 57 paid off since, ...	255	0	0

Leaving remaining due on 3rd April, 1879, ... £ 8,945 13 4

April 8th, 1879.

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 8.—(Page 31.)

RETURN showing the NET AMOUNT ledger by the COLLECTOR-GENERAL of RATES to credit of the Waterworks Fund, during seventeen years, to 31st August, 1878.

—	Domestic Rates.	Public Rates.	Contract and Meter Rates.	Rates Municipal.	Amount of previous Rates.	Total.
1852	£ 11,257 10 5	4,708 18 1	1,354 12 9	—	5,315 0 0	22,819 1 8
1853	21,934 9 1	5,299 4 10	1,719 8 1	—	114 8 11	29,727 5 11
1854	29,886 15 7	6,133 12 8	1,763 12 8	—	9 6 9	30,793 7 8
1855	23,143 12 5	6,091 8 1	1,688 18 8	—	6 11 1	30,098 11 3
1856	22,437 16 0	6,978 3 4	1,861 3 8	—	—	29,887 3 0
1857	22,065 19 2	6,874 5 4	1,887 3 9	—	—	29,487 8 5
1858	23,130 4 6	6,217 11 0	1,672 14 5	11 18 0	—	31,032 5 11
1859	23,547 18 2	6,295 17 0	2,232 7 11	2,232 17 7	—	34,220 0 8
1860	22,891 5 2	6,143 13 11	5,146 0 3	1,222 0 9	—	35,545 0 1
1861	23,916 9 8	6,139 17 8	10,880 6 1	2,566 7 0	—	42,571 0 2
1862	29,268 2 6	6,979 7 0	18,491 8 1	3,196 5 3	—	44,816 0 10
1863	25,393 5 6	6,248 1 2	11,201 4 8	4,284 14 11	—	43,169 6 0
1864	24,381 6 5	6,481 1 4	13,507 9 2	4,484 13 3	—	47,774 10 4
1865	24,517 12 4	6,020 11 8	12,287 2 0	5,163 13 8	—	50,198 6 8
1866	24,190 2 6	6,271 10 1	13,936 1 1	4,270 7 3	—	49,548 0 11
1867	22,856 1 0	6,793 16 11	14,738 12 2	5,511 2 6	—	51,048 18 2
1868	23,143 8 10	7,301 13 8	14,386 6 6	5,683 15 0	—	59,328 3 9
	385,138 7 0	105,819 13 0	122,469 10 11	39,598 13 0	5,848 9 9	638,592 6 3

May 20th, 1879.

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 9.—(Page 32.)

ABSTRACT of RENTAL from the year commencing 1st September, 1859, to the year ended 31st August, 1878.

—	Amount Received during the beginning of each Financial Year	Year's Rent to 25th March in each Year	Total	Received thereon and statement.	Amount at end of Financial Year.	Total
1860	£ 8,137 10 4	17,122 5 6	25,269 15 10	17,440 5 92	7,904 10 0	20,249 5 24
1861	7,700 10 0	17,086 10 4	24,891 8 42	17,085 2 8	7,223 18 8	24,821 8 42
1862	7,225 10 8	17,015 6 2	24,241 4 104	17,608 1 0	6,633 8 9	24,241 4 104
1863	6,633 3 9	17,405 8 0	26,035 11 84	16,967 1 4	7,071 10 42	24,030 18 82
1864	7,071 10 42	17,643 17 35	24,715 7 8	17,570 13 0	7,144 14 0	24,715 7 8
1865	7,144 14 0	17,388 0 0	26,702 19 0	18,281 19 4	6,622 8 8	24,702 19 0
1866	6,421 8 8	17,700 14 3	26,122 3 1	16,647 0 7	7,475 3 6	24,122 3 1
1867	7,475 2 6	18,004 6 2	26,678 7 3	18,493 11 11	6,983 15 4	26,470 7 3
1868	6,963 15 4	18,189 13 4	25,173 8 8	18,524 9 0	6,949 6 6	25,173 8 8
1869	6,949 6 6	18,276 6 6	25,225 15 0	18,622 7 1	6,983 8 11	25,225 13 0
1870	6,562 5 11	18,276 10 9	24,839 2 8	17,965 10 6	6,872 19 2	24,829 2 8
1871	6,812 12 9	18,585 17 1	26,109 9 5	18,603 6 2	6,294 3 3	25,159 9 3
1872	6,255 3 1	18,290 11 1	26,546 14 1	17,646 2 2	6,900 11 11	24,546 14 1
1873	6,003 11 11	18,380 13 1	25,981 5 6	17,230 6 18	7,930 18 1	25,881 5 6
1874	7,030 16 1	18,426 6 6	26,371 4 7	16,370 9 1	8,000 15 6	26,371 4 7
1875	8,000 15 6	18,325 5 0	26,295 0 6	20,588 2 5	8,150 18 1	26,295 0 6
1876	6,160 18 1	17,811 11 6	23,902 9 7	15,444 7 10	8,518 1 9	25,902 9 7
1877	8,018 1 9	17,997 0 3	26,550 8 10	15,928 5 10	6,645 2 14	26,550 8 10
	35 8 8	17,473 4 6	24,118 7 6	18,861 13 7	5,926 7 13	24,118 7 6

May 20th, 1879.

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 10.—(Page 32.)
STATEMENTS OF RENTS as shown by Abstracts of Standard Rental Account.

	Asset Revenue.	All Hallens.	Mary's Abbey.	St. George's.	Total.	
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	
	1 15 3½	20 12 5	122 0 0	—	144 5 11½	
1860	—	—	—	—	—	Accommodation of insolvent arrears written off under Act of Council of 11 March, 1860; an accommodation from the old Corporation of £1,100 included.
1861	763 14 3	206 9 4	331 11 6	83 10 6	2,087 5 9	
1862	—	16 6 0	—	—	16 6 0	
1863	—	38 0 0	—	—	38 0 0	
1864	—	—	—	—	—	
1865	—	550 5 5	—	—	550 5 5	Per 27 and 28 Vict., c. 203, 1866, by Act of Parliament.
1866	—	—	—	—	—	
1867	5 5 6	—	—	—	5 5 6	
1868	77 9 0	27 10 0	41 9 0	—	145 10 0	
1869	80 0 0	—	—	—	80 0 0	
1870	24 1 10	—	9 13 0	—	33 14 10	
1871	470 9 8	80 19 8	229 18 0	2 0 0	723 7 4	By Act of Council.
1872	56 0 0	—	—	—	56 0 0	
1873	49 12 4	—	—	—	49 12 4	
1874	—	—	—	—	—	
1875	10 1 6	—	—	—	10 1 6	
1876	21 0 0	—	—	—	21 0 0	
1877	14 0 0	—	23 0 0	—	37 0 0	
1878	—	25 0 0	20 0 0	—	45 0 0	
Total,	1,611 18 6½	1,316 8 1	1,267 2 6	85 10 0	4,400 14 7½	

Percentage of loss on collection, ...

12s. 6d.

May 20th, 1879.

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 11.—(Page 32.)

INTEREST FOR ONE YEAR on BALANCES of LOANS remaining due on 3rd April, 1879, and on BALANCE of LLOYD'S BONDS.

BOROUGH FUND ACCOUNTS.—

City Debentures,	£168,375 18 0 at 4 per cent.,	56,750 18 2
Do.	22,500 0 0 do,	940 0 0
Loan for Artisans' Dwellings,	12,287 9 0 do,	519 18 4

Total payable on Borough Fund Account,

£3,187 16 6

IMPROVEMENT FUND OR RATE.—

Balance of advance from Bank of Ireland, half-year, on £1,000, and half-year on £900 at 5 per cent.,

12 10 0

Balance of advance from Law Life Assurance Society, at 4½ per cent.,

765 0 0

Do. do. do. do. 1,282 10 0

CAFFIE MARKET ACCOUNT.—

On 217,000 Cattle Market Bonds, at 6 per cent.,	£1,012 0 0
340 do. do. at 5 do.	27 10 0
3,500 do. da. at 4½ do.	157 10 0
2,500 do. do. at 5 do.	210 0 0

1,407 0 0

On 23,945 12 7, balance thereof remaining due, at 5 per cent.,

467 5 7

Total payable on Improvement Fund Account and Cattle Market Account, &c., and on Bonds of Institutions,

£3,914 0 7

WATERWORKS LOANS.—

Annual Instalment of Terminus Annuity,	12,100 0 0
On balance due Economic Insurance Society, viz. £24,000 at 4½ per cent.,	1,080 0 0
On balance due Hand-in-Hand Insurance Company, viz. £20,000 at 5 per cent.,	1,195 0 0

1,760 0 0

On issue of Debentures, Nos. 2 to 122, £2,000 at 5 per cent.,	180 0 0
Do. Mortgages, Nos. 123 to 164, £4,000 at 4½ do.,	315 0 0
Do. do. Nos. 165 to 178, £2,000 at 4½ do.,	90 0 0

105 0 0

On Mortgage, No. 191, £31,270, for half-year, and on £20,000, for half-year, at 4 per cent.,	1,239 0 0
On re-issue of Mortgage, Nos. 192 to 203, for £5,000 at 4½ per cent.,	265 0 0
Do. do. Nos. 204 to 215, £2,000 at 4½ do.,	90 0 0
Do. do. Nos. 216 to 217, £1,000 at 4½ do.,	180 0 0

105 0 0

On issue of Mortgages, Nos. 221 to 233, for £1,000 at 4½ do.,	270 0 0
On re-issue of do. Nos. 234 to 236, £1,000 at 4½ do.,	65 0 0
Do. do. Nos. 237 to 240, £1,000 at 4½ do.,	105 0 0
Do. do. Nos. 241, for £500 at 4½ do.,	21 0 0

85 0 0

On old Pipe Water Debenture debt of £79,015 7 8 at 4 per cent.,	2,880 12 2
---	---------	---------	------------

2,880 12 2

Total payable on Waterworks Fund Account,

£26,908 7 2

Total,

£41,032 9 3

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 12.—(Page 33.)—

TABLE showing the GENERAL RATE which it would appear necessary to levy in the event of the annexation to Dublin of the several Townships, &c., specified, based on the present valuation and on the assumption that the poundage rates now being levied by the several Local Authorities are sufficient for the requirements of their Districts.

	Valuation	Municipal Poundage Rate.	Prelim.	Poundage Buckets	Poundage Inches	Product at the 11½ in 6 on the several Valuations	Decrease,	Increase,
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
Dublin, —	65,000 0 0	4 6	128,800 0 0	0 6½	—	180,840 3 6	35,550 38 7	—
Rathgarve, —	66,613 0 0	2 4	11,440 0 0	—	1 7½	19,600 2 6	—	8,129 5 5
Persebridge, —	64,296 0 0	3 7	15,697 0 0	—	—	16,500 11 6	—	3,739 11 6
Rathmines, —	50,013 0 0	3 4	12,020 0 0	—	—	17,000 22 6	—	234 12 6
Dartmouth, —	17,000 0 0	3 8	3,600 0 0	—	0 11½	2,070 18 4	—	622 18 4
Country, —	619,014 0 0	—	164,800 0 0	—	—	161,020 11 6	—	12,700 8 3
—	180,000 0 0	—	—	—	—	2,010 9 4	—	3,770 8 4
—	661,044 0 0	—	—	—	—	164,800 0 0	36,550 38 7	36,550 38 7

As 11½d. is the £ of total valuation will produce the sum of £164,800, being the total amount of the product of the several poundage rates.

April 8th, 1879.

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 13.—(Page 35.)

SALARIES OF OFFICERS of the CORPORATION of DUBLIN, made up to April, 1879.

	£ s. d.		£ s. d.
Lord Mayor, —	2,322 10 0	Two Inspectors of Disinfecting Chamber, —	27 10 0
Town Clerk, —	300 0 0	Two Inspectors of Weights and Measures	—
Assistant to the Town Clerk, —	150 0 0	and of unmeasured meat, —	150 0 0
Other assistants to the Town Clerk, —	154 0 0	Inspectors of Nuisances, —	128 19 9
City Treasurer, —	450 0 0	Clerk in Statuary Office, —	78 0 0
City Accountant, —	450 0 0	Inspector of Hay and Straw Market, &c., —	100 0 0
City Engineer, —	750 0 0	Assistant to City Engineer—Waterworks, —	—
Law Agent, —	600 0 0	country department, —	400 0 0
Do., allowance paid his assistants, —	150 0 0	Assistant to City Engineer—Waterworks, —	—
One Water Officer, —	200 0 0	city department, —	350 0 0
Sword Bearer, —	250 0 0	Inspector of water-taps, —	180 0 0
Master Bearer and Officer of Commissaries, —	250 0 0	Telegraph clerk in office of Engineer, —	117 0 0
High Constable and Police Master, —	150 0 0	Clerk, —	200 5 0
Secretary to Waterworks and to Committees	—	Assistant in City Treasurer's office, —	125 0 0
No 2, —	—	Do., —	104 0 0
Supervisor to City Waterworks, —	250 0 0	Do., —	104 0 0
Chief of the Fire Brigade, —	400 0 0	Do., —	98 0 0
Lieutenant of 600, —	100 0 0	General Clerk of Works, —	104 0 0
Superintendent of the New Cattle Market	—	—	—
and Collector of Tolls, —	100 0 0	—	12,922 3 9
Two assistants to the City Accountant, —	150 0 0	The Recorder, —	234 4 8
Secretary to No. 1 Committee, —	200 0 0	Clerk of Peace and his	—
Assistants in Secretary's office, —	150 0 0	assistants, —	1,190 0 0
Do., do., —	78 0 0	Sessions Court Officers, —	383 4 0
Do., do., —	78 0 0	—	—
Book-keeper in 60, —	175 0 0	Appointments since 1853-70:—	—
Assistant do., —	125 0 0	Secretary Committee No. 3, £200 0 0	—
One Inspector of flagging and paving, —	125 0 0	Deputy Surveyor, —	260 0 0
Two Inspectors of stonemasons, —	183 10 0	Salaries paid by Artisans' Dwelling Committee, —	100 0 0
Inspector of Sewers, —	100 0 0	The salary of the City Coroner, viz., £200 per annum, is likewise paid by the Corporation; it was not included in the return of 1876	—
Assistant Surveyor in the City Engineer's Department, —	175 0 0	—	660 0 0
Two clerks, —	104 0 0	—	—
Inspector of Lighting and tester of gasometers, —	300 0 0	—	—
Executive Sanitary Officer, £344 1s, less	—	—	—
reduced by Local Government Board, £45, Consulting Sanitary Officer, £300, less do., —	301 9 0	—	—
do., £75, —	985 0 0	—	—
City Analyst, Medical Officer of health, —	300 0 0	—	—
Inspector of petroleum lamps, —	10 0 0	—	—
Keeper of Merguez, —	32 0 0	—	—

Note.—Several sums are brought to credit on account of this year; thus the Lord Mayor lodges the fees and fees of his Court (about £100), the Town Clerk the fees of his office (about £30), the Sword Bearer the rest of the Divisional Salerooms (£200), the Inspector of Lighting, his fees as tester of incense (about £200), the Clerk of the Peace, fees amounting to about £700; in all about £1,200. Law costs recovered are also lodged, and include usual charges as between attorney and client, and may be set off as against so much of the salaries of the Law Agent and his assistants.

April 10th, 1879.

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 14.—(Page 35.)
TABLE NO. 1.—CONTRACTS WITH TOWNSHIPS.

Township.	Date of Fulfilment.	Present Valuation	Rate per Unit of the Funds	Present Rate.	Magazines of the Corporation to the several Townships.
No. 1.—Pembroke,	19th & 20th Vic., exp. Th. n. 4L	\$11,764 2 6	2 1/2	1,344 18 6	The Corporation shall "supply and therefrom continue to supply a quantity of water equivalent to 10 gallons per head per day for the population from time to time of the Township." "The water to be delivered at high pressure to the Commissioners at such point or points (not exceeding three in number) as may be selected by the Commissioners, in the portion of the main pipe of the Corporation passing through the said Township, as follows:
No. 2.—Blackrock,	20th & 21st Vic., exp. Th. n. 5L	40,546 30 8	2 1/2	482 4 18	The Corporation shall "supply and therefrom continue to supply a quantity of water equivalent to 10 gallons per head per day for the population from time to time of the Township." "The water to be delivered at high pressure to the Commissioners at such point or points (not exceeding three in number) as may be selected by the Commissioners, in the portion of the main pipe of the Corporation passing through the said Township, as follows:
No. 3.—Kilmallock,	21st & 22nd Vic., exp. Th. n. 5L	5,242 18 0	4	130 18 18	The Corporation shall "supply and therefrom continue to supply a quantity of water not less than 10 gallons per head per day for the population of the Township from time to time." "The water to be delivered by the Corporation to the Commissioners at high pressure in a point within the limits of the Township, as fixed by the Act, and adjoining the municipal boundary, through a pipe or pipes connected with their mains at such point as may be mutually agreed upon by the Corporation and the Commissioners, each party to be so liable as to be capable of delivering the water of the Corporation under a head of not less than two feet above the level of the sea at low water, or in the same level that may have been by them fixed and the supply of water in the city of Dublin."
No. 4.—Clonard,	21st & 22nd Vic., exp. Th. n. 4L	31,251 10 0	4	229 2 12	The Corporation shall "supply and therefrom continue to supply a quantity of water equivalent to 10 gallons per head per day for the population from time to time of the Township." "The water to be delivered by the Corporation to the Commissioners at high pressure at a point within the limits of the Township, as fixed by the Act, and adjoining the municipal boundary, through a pipe or pipes connected with their mains at such point as may be mutually agreed upon by the Corporation and the Commissioners, each party to be so liable as to be capable of delivering the water of the Corporation under a head of not less than two feet above the level of the sea at low water, or in the same level that may have been by them fixed and the supply of water in the city of Dublin."
No. 5.—Kingstown,	21st & 22nd Vic., exp. Th. n. 4L	40,187 2 0 0	2	1,880 6 10	The Corporation shall "supply and therefrom continue to supply a quantity of water equivalent to 10 gallons per head per day for the population from time to time of the Township." "The water to be delivered by the Corporation to the Commissioners at high pressure in a point within the limits of the Township, as fixed by the Act, and adjoining the municipal boundary, through a pipe or pipes connected with their mains at such point as may be mutually agreed upon by the Corporation and the Commissioners, each party to be so liable as to be capable of delivering the water of the Corporation under a head of not less than two feet above the level of the sea at low water."
No. 6.—Bray,	21st & 22nd Vic., exp. Th. n. 4L	21,101 2 0 0	4	528 10 4	The Corporation shall "supply and therefrom continue to supply a quantity of water equivalent to 10 gallons per head per day for the population from time to time of the Township." "The water to be delivered by the Corporation to the Commissioners at high pressure in a point within the limits of the Township, as fixed by the Act, and adjoining the municipal boundary, through a pipe or pipes connected with their mains at such point as may be mutually agreed upon by the Corporation and the Commissioners, each party to be so liable as to be capable of delivering the water of the Corporation under a head of not less than 240 feet above the level of the sea at low water."
No. 7.—Dunleary,	20th & 21st Vic., exp. Th. n. 5L	11,736 8 0 0	4	180 12 1	The Corporation shall "supply and therefrom continue to supply a quantity of water not less than 10 gallons per head per day for the population of the Township from time to time." "The water to be delivered by the Corporation to the Commissioners at high pressure at a point within the limits of the Township, as fixed by the Act, through a pipe or pipes connected with their mains at a point where they might intersect across the public roads."
No. 8.—Kilbroney and Ballyboden,	Special Deed of Contract dated 18th Oct., 1871.	9,163 18 0 0	6	152 7 8	The Commissioners shall be at Ballyboden to-day and take from the main or pipes of the Corporation, at the boundary of the Township, a supply of Vartry water at high pressure for the use of the inhabitants of the said Township, such supply to be a quantity equal to but not greater than 10 gallons per head per day of the population of Kilbroney and Ballyboden Township, the payment to be taken from time to time of the bill passing under rates or to be stated in the report of the Great Commissioners.
Total,				4,369 18 87	

APPENDIX No. 15.—(Page 51.)

FIRE BRIGADE DEPARTMENT.

Abridged Statement of RECEIPTS and PAYMENTS, from 1862 to 1878.

RECEIPTS				PAYMENTS					
	£	s	d		£	s	d		
1862, August 31st, Amount produced by rates,	2,568	9	10	1863, August 31st, Net amount of payments,	672	4	11		
do.	do.	3,010	10	do.	3,363	4	0		
1864, do.	do.	3,969	7	do.	4,286	3	5		
1865, do.	do.	3,945	10	do.	2,611	1	5		
1866, do.	do.	2,393	1	do.	2,322	10	11		
1867, do.	do.	2,337	2	do.	3,860	13	9		
1868, do.	do.	2,166	15	do.	2,677	18	8		
1869, do.	do.	2,158	8	do.	2,313	2	9		
1870, do.	do.	2,071	16	do.	2,589	18	5		
1871, do.	do.	2,079	18	do.	2,039	13	11		
1872, do.	do.	2,139	13	do.	2,367	15	2		
1873, do.	do.	2,304	10	do.	2,429	1	0		
1874, do.	do.	2,236	17	do.	2,309	19	10		
1875, do.	do.	2,185	16	do.	2,633	0	1		
1876, do.	do.	2,135	15	do.	2,745	3	9		
1877, do.	do.	2,396	18	do.	2,862	19	7		
1878, do.	do.	3,630	16	do.	2,860	1	0		
Total Receipts,	—	31,099	18	4	Total Payments,	—	42,275	1	9

April 8, 1879.

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 16.—(Page 68.)

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE.

RETURN of SANITARY OPERATIONS from 1st January, 1876, to 31st May, 1879.

	No.	Weight
Sewers and house drains constructed, Enforced,	716	
Do. repaired and cleaned, do.	3,906	
Privies and water-closets constructed, do.	802	
Do. repaired, do.	4,804	
Aspirits constructed, ... do.	619	
Privies and aspirits cleaned, ... do.	33,120	
Dwellings repaired, ... do.	16,250	
Dwellings cleaned, ... do.	91,700	
Dwellings condemned and closed, being unfit for human habitation, ... do.	404	
Dwellings reported to the City Engineer as being dangerous, ... do.	189	
Cellar dwellings condemned and closed, ... do.	116	
Yards and external premises cleaned, Enforced, 11,098		
Lanes and alleys cleaned by private parties, do.	1,772	
Accumulations of manure removed, do.	4,828	
Swine removed from dwellings, Enforced, 148		
Other animals removed from dwellings, do.	332	
Swine removed from yards where kept excessively, ... do.	2,937	
Bairness from smoke shated, ... do.	4	
Do. from gas and coke manufacturers, ... do.	2	
Do. from chemical works, ... do.	2	
Do. from manure works, ... do.	2	
Do. from other manufacturers, ... do.	2	
Miscellaneous offences abated, ... do.	1,318	
Inspection of tenement houses, ... do.	183,494	
Do. tenement rooms, ... do.	48,391	
Do. nightly lodging houses, ... do.	10,390	
Do. bakeries, ... do.	5,370	
Do. slaughter houses, ... do.	9,396	
Do. dairy yards, ... do.	10,237	
Certificates of destination to article to grasshoppers instrument, ... do.	1,967	
Water supplied to tenement houses, Enforced, 665		
Sanitary defects discovered, ... do.	96,192	
Sanitary defects remedied, ... do.	94,732	
Infected dwellings inspected and cleaned, Enforced		
Do. chemically disinfected, do.	5,485	
Reports received from Medical Sanitary Officers, 3,149		
Patients removed by hospital cabs, ... do.	698	
Reservoirs for disinfection by rates, ... do.	4,379	
Detections of unclean rent, ... do.	689	
Do. do. dirt, ... do.	10	
Do. do. fruit, ... do.	15	
Do. do. vegetables, ... do.	9	
Do. disinfected milk, ... do.	231	
Do. do. butter, ... do.	5	
Do. do. eggs, ... do.	1	
Do. do. codex, ... do.	6	
Do. do. cheese, ... do.	1	
Do. do. mustard, ... do.	28	
Do. do. soap, ... do.	1	
Samples collected for analysis, ... do.	5,880	
Articles found adulterated on analysis, ... do.	435	
Law costs incurred in prosecutions, ... do.	3 4 2	
Disinfecting chamber used by persons, ... do.	2,426	
Number of articles disinfected, ... do.	23,092	
Total expense of chamber for the month, ... do.	4,253 8 4	
Number of registered nightly lodgings, ... do.	146	
Amount of accommodation thereto, ... do.	413	
Number of registered slaughter houses, ... do.	97	
Mortality from all causes, ... do.	74	
Average per 1,000 of the population, ... do.	30 8	
Deaths by gynaecia, ... do.	3,982	
Admissions to fever hospitals, ... do.	4,556	
Total Disbursements, ... do.	£19,300 0 3	

STATISTICS OF MORTALITY.

			Total General Mortality	Deaths by Diseases
1876,	8,987	3,419
1877,	8,793	3,528
1878,	9,269	3,646

SANITARY STAFF.

Secretary and Executive Sanitary Officer.

JAMES BOYLE, C.E., City Hall.

Superintendent Medical Officer.

EDWARD DILLOU MASTHER, M.D., 6, Mansfield-square, North

City Analyst and Medical Officer of Health.

CHARLES ALEXANDER CARRIBER, M.D., 18, Pembroke-road

Medical Officers of Health, being Medical Officers of Dispensaries.

No.	Dispensary.	Address.	Name of Office.	Address
1	North City,	10, Summer-hill, ...	J. H. Ferguson, m.d., ...	26, Upper Stamford-street.
			John P. Nolan, m.d., ...	16, Talbot-street.
2	Do.,	Eastgate-street, ...	John Waddell, m.d., ...	Emmald-street.
		20, Colmore-street,	Richard E. Whine, m.d., ...	34, North Frederick-street.
3	Do.,	32, Blackhall-street,	Joseph K. Kenny, m.d., ...	71, Lower Garlands-street.
			Albert O. Speedy, m.d., ...	28, North Frederick-street.
			William Dudley Whyte, m.d., ...	38, Binstone-street.
1	South City,	91, Marsh-street,	H. G. Croley, m.d., ...	27, Hanover-street.
2	Do.,	33, High-street, ...	Thomas Purcell, m.d., ...	71, Hanover-street.
3	Do.,	16, Peter street, ...	John Ryan, m.d., ...	118, Feathers-street.
4	Do.,	Grand Canal-street,	E. Peake, m.d., ...	45, Lower Bagdad-street.
			Charles F. Moore, m.d., ...	10, Upper Mansfield-street.
			John Shortt, m.d., ...	8, Hanington-street.
			Hamilton Lobbin, m.d., ...	1, Upper Fitzwilliam-street.
			John A. Byrne, m.d., ...	37, Westland-row.

Clerk.

JOSEPH G. BOLGER, — — — — — City Hall

Sanitary Police.

Acting Inspector,	...	James Halligan,	9, St. Patrick's-place.
Sergeant,	...	Timothy Fay, 1st A., ...	Kevin-street Barracks.
Do.	...	John Dugg, 2d A., ...	Bridewell-lane.
Do.	...	James Kavanagh, 4 A., ...	New-market.
Acting-Sergeant,	...	Michael Neill, 3d B., ...	Lad-lane.
Do.	...	Thomas Hoyne, 8d C., ...	Summer-hill.
Constable,	...	Christopher Waldron, 7d B., ...	College-street.
Do.	...	Laurence Brown, 7d B., ...	College-street.
Do.	...	Mathan Flynn, 10d A., ...	New-market.
Do.	...	John Hickley, 13d A., ...	Chancery-lane.
Do.	...	Jacob Peirson, 3d C., ...	Sackville-place.
Do.	...	Patrick MacIntyre, 4d C., ...	Summer-hill.
Do.	...	Robert D'Arcy, 7d B., ...	Green-street.

Inspectors of Meat, Milk, Fish, &c.

EPIPHANIA G. WEBB,	—	—	William-street
GEORGE EDWARDS,	—	—	Do
STANDING BELLISTER,	—	—	95, Mountpleasant-square

Sanitary Appliances.

Disinfecting Chamber,	—	Corporation Depot, Marrowbone-lane.
Mortuary House and Coroner's Court,	—	2, Marlborough-street.
Hospital Case, Van, &c.,	—	Application at City Hall, or at 13, Barn-place.

List of Sanitary Staff and their Salaries.

			£	s.	d.
Secretary, Engineer, and Executive Sanitary Officer,	—	—	350	0	0
Superintendent Medical Officer,	—	—	350	0	0
Medical Officer of Health and City Analyst,	—	—	360	0	0
Fifteen Medical Officers of Dispensaries at £25 per annum,	—	—	375	0	0
One Sanitary Inspector,	—	—	100	0	0
Three Sanitary Sergeants Inspectors of Nolences at £34,	—	—	392	0	0
Two Acting-Sergeants do. do. at £29 4s.	—	—	178	8	0
Seven Constables do. do. at £78.	—	—	546	0	0
Three Inspectors of Meat, Milk, Fish, &c.,	—	—	124	0	0
Office Clerk,	—	—	78	0	0
Keeper of Disinfecting Chamber,	—	—	52	0	0
Chief Disinfector,	—	—	50	0	0
Assistant Disinfector,	—	—	52	0	0
Messenger to City Analyst,	—	—	18	0	0
Three Labourers employed in lime-making and cleaning infested dwellings,	—	—	140	0	0
Total.	—	—	1,034	0	0

APPENDIX No. 17.—(Page 111.)

MEMORIAL to W. A. EXHAM, Esq., Q.C., and C. P. CORROS, Esq., C.E., Boundary Commissioners,

GENTLEMEN,—We, the undersigned Ratepayers of Dublin, desire to express our opinion that the extension of the city boundaries in the manner proposed by the Corporation would not be to the public advantage. It would be but an extension without reformation of the system of the Dublin Corporation.

For many years past serious complaints have from time to time been made to Government and Parliament of the management by the Corporation of the local affairs of Dublin, and various remedies have been suggested.

In the Session of 1876 a Select Committee of the House of Commons was, on the motion of the Chief Secretary, appointed to inquire into the working of Municipal Institutions in Ireland, and to report what alterations were advisable in the law relating thereto.

The Select Committee, presided over by Sir M. E. Beach, M.P., sat during the greater part of the Sessions of 1876, '77, and '78, and examined many witnesses. In addition, at the suggestion of the Committee, the assistance was obtained of a Commission, which visited a large number of cities and towns, including Dublin, and having examined a large number

of witnesses, reported the evidence for the information of the Select Committee.

As the result of all these inquiries, a Report from the Select Committee was presented to the House of Commons, on the 2nd July, 1878. To that Report we refer you for the following, relating to Dublin:—“That in Dublin there is ground to complain of.—The slack attendance at Council Meetings, the postponement of, and inattention to, important business; the condition of the streets; the deficiency of sanitary action, the want of economy; the want of control over officers and workmen; the mixing up of different funds in the accounts, and of the management of the city estate.”

To cure these evils the Committee recommended reforms whereby the present Corporation would be dissolved, and another would be elected, constituted, and controlled, as experience has shown to be necessary for the better Local Government of Dublin.

We cannot but regret that as yet no attempt has been made to give effect to those recommendations, and trust that in your report you will urge upon the Government the necessity for immediate action.

Signed by RICHARD MORRIS, 16, Wicklow-street, and 280 Ratepayers.

APPENDIX No. 18.—(Page 120.)

PARTICULARS OF RATES IN RATHMINES TOWNSHIP.

ACCOUNTS, 1877.

Id. in Valuation, £22,768, produces £387.

	£	s	d	£	s	d
County Dublin Grand Jury,	2,001	7	2	none	0	5
Alliance Gas Company,	1,065	9	10	0	3	
Roads,	£1,619	15	8			
Contributions,	197	15	8			
	3,422	0	0	0	9	
Salaries,	792	0	2	0	2	
Sanctuary,	£1,064	15	8			
Rent Town Hall,	21	18	0			
	1,039	17	8	0	3	
Sanitary,	£255	3	3			
Contribution, Local Government Board, 51	5	0				
	203	16	8	0	4	
Water	23,011	0	3			
Water rents,	452	0	4			
	2,571	13	11	0	4	
	2	51				

ACCOUNTS, 1878.

Id. in Valuation, £20,465, produces £403.

	£	s	d	£	s	d
County Dublin Grand Jury,	1,834	15	4	0	4	
Alliance Gas Company, gas,	1,029	0	2	0	2	
Roads,	£3,459	13	10			
Contributions,	353	12	4			
	3,146	3	4	0	7	
Salaries,	803	0	0	0	2	
Sanctuary,	£390	12	1			
Rent Town Hall,	24	11	0			
	866	2	7	0	1	
Sanitary,	£287	8	5			
Contributions,	16	12	6			
	951	15	11	0	6	
Water,	£2,771	1	6			
Water rents,	612	10	10			
	2,156	10	10	0	4	
	2	4				

4d. debt of last year and balance of this year.

Mr. Stokes' evidence applies to 1873 when the value was £89,780.

APPENDIX No. 19.—(Page 122.)

DUBLIN CORPORATION WATER WORKS

CURRENT EXPENSES, 1891.

	£	s	d
Maintenance and repairs of works, &c., including salaries of officers, wages, clothing and contracts, ...	12,948	15	0
Proportion of salaries of corporate officers, ...	634	13	11
Annuities and compensations, ...	598	17	7
Stationery, printing, stationery, and advertising, ...	347	10	2
Law and Parliamentary expenses, ...	559	10	4
Proportion of cost of maintenance of City Hall, ...	231	9	10
Rents of various premises, ...	177	19	10
Rents of lands occupied by Water Works, ...	638	17	9
Rates and taxes in county and city, ...	4,133	2	7
Water rents to Canal Companies, ...	1,337	8	7
Interest and expenses of temporary loans, ...	93	1	4
Expenses incidental to loans, ...	9	1	0
	21,509	9	1

This expenditure includes nearly £1,000 which appears to have been the cost of making good the burst pipe at Cocklebarrow river.

RECEIPTS, 1891.

	£	s	d
From rents of various premises, ...	69	13	0
Water sold to shipping and for various purposes, ...	691	16	10
For works executed for various parties, ...	8,483	18	9
Law costs and Parliamentary expenses, ...	27	12	8
From water sold by meter and contract, ...	14,778	19	9
By water sold to townships, ...	5,611	2	6
	35,462	14	4

CURRENT EXPENSES, 1878.

	£	s	d
Maintenance and repairs of works, &c., including salaries of officers, wages, clothing and annuities, ...	10,558	13	7
Proportion of salaries of corporate officers, ...	755	19	5
Compensation, retinues, and compensations, ...	933	16	1
Stationery, printing, stationery, and advertising, ...	319	10	2
Law and Parliamentary expenses, ...	394	19	1
Proportion of cost of maintenance of City Hall, ...	386	15	11
Rents of various premises, ...	267	11	1
Rents of lands occupied by Water Works, ...	658	17	8
Rates and taxes in county and city, ...	6,730	4	7
Water rents to Canal Companies, ...	1,369	0	11
Interest and expenses of temporary loans, ...	684	15	6
Expenses incidental to loans, ...	65	17	2
	22,391	19	3

RECEIPTS, 1878.

	£	s	d
From rents of various premises, ...	70	7	0
Water sold to shipping and for various purposes, ...	424	0	9
For works executed for various parties, ...	2,163	6	6
Law costs and Parliamentary expenses, ...	150	15	0
From water sold by meter and contract, ...	14,395	6	6
By water sold to townships, ...	5,481	15	0
	23,631	0	0

APPENDIX No. 20.—(Page 200.)

To the RIGHT HONORABLE the LORD MAYOR, ALDERMEN and BURGESSSES of the CITY OF DUBLIN in COUNCIL assembled.

We, the undersigned property holders, house-holders, and ratepayers of the township of Clontarf,

Humbly beg to call the special attention of your Lordship and the Municipal Council to the following:

We beg to express our surprise and dissatisfaction at the exclusion of our township (by the answer to the queries submitted by the Royal Commissioners to your Council) from all participation in the extension of the city boundary.

In doing so, we respectfully submit that the township of Clontarf, is in close proximity to the city, it being one of the most favorite resorts of the citizens for society and healthful recreation.

In response to the observations of your respected Town Councillor, Mr. J. P. Byrne, as to the ample land separating the city boundary from the houses in Clontarf, we confidently assure your Lordship and the Council that upon a great portion of that land a number of valuable residences have been erected and numerous others are in course of erection.

Your Lordship and the Council may be aware that the club lands are at present the subject of reclamation.

We submit and refer your Lordship and the Council to the great number of valuable residences, detached villas, terraces, and avenues, built and erected within our township since the last valuation of property, as well as the vast increase in population.

With reference to the allegation of Mr. Byrne that, "Clontarf is a sea-bound place, and had means of being supplied with coal and other matters quite differently from the other townships," we respectfully submit in answer to the fallacy of this argument, that there is not, and never has been any means of obtaining supplies for domestic or other purposes save from the city.

It is true that a vessel, laden with coals, sometimes appears at the seashore of Dailymount, but the only residents who can avail themselves of this small boon are gentry and farmers who have the facility to cart home the coals, the householders and residents being compelled to obtain their supplies from the Metropolis.

The Royal Irish Constabulary than whom there is no more efficient and well-organized body, in numerical strength, fall far short for the protection of life and property in our township, and for years past we have been and are looking anxiously forward for the extension of the Metropolitan Police, as also that useful body, the Fire Brigade.

We respectfully submit the anomaly is inexplicable where we observe the existence of the Metropolitan Police Force on the southern and other northern suburbs to the extent of ten miles distance, whereas through the sparsity of the ratiocination, the Clontarf township has been deprived of their valuable and indispensable services.

Other anomalies which we cannot comprehend are, that our township commencing within one mile from the Post Office should be deprived of sewerage, cleaning, cleaning, paving, sanitary, sufficient gaslight, and many other advantages even at present afforded to the other townships.

We, therefore, pray that your Lordship and the Municipal Council will reconsider our grievances and impress on the Royal Commissioners about to sit the urgency of an extension of the city boundary to our township.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

APPENDIX No. 21.—(Page 203.)

Clogstoy, 26 April, 1879.

Sir,—I am directed to forward to you the following copy of a Resolution passed at a Meeting of the Clogstoy Township Commissioners, held Tuesday, the 8th day of April, 1879.—

John F. BLOD, Esq., in the Chair.

Resolved.—That our secretary write to the Chairman of the Municipal Boundaries Commissioners, that at a meeting

of the Township Commissioners of Clogstoy, held this day, it was resolved that they are opposed in the interest of the ratepayers, to the township being annexed to the City Corporation, or coming within the Municipal Boundary

" J. BALCOMBE, Secretary.

" The Chairman,
" Municipal Boundaries Commissioners."

APPENDIX No. 22.—(Page 219.)

NEW KILMAINHAM TOWNSHIP COMMISSIONERS.

GENERAL ANNUAL ACCOUNT to 31st December, 1878.

RECEIPTS.	£	s	d	EXPENSES.	£	s	d
In hands of clerk at close of last account,	12	10	6	Salaries,	111	6	0
Rates collected and lodged in bank,	1,181	3	9	Rent to Grand Canal Company,	1	10	0
From Land Government Board, as a proportion of Survey Officers' salaries,	90	0	0	TAXES,	6	0	10
Contributions from Government in lieu of rates,	114	7	3	Road repairs, scavenging, &c.,	445	9	1
Proportion of Dog Tax,	7	3	9	Lighting Township lamps,	56	0	6
Miscellaneous, including £30 from Corporation of Dublin for repairs of Boundary-road,	31	5	0	Advertising, printing, stationery, &c.,	11	5	1
Water rent,	79	4	6	Interest on loan,	29	13	6
Over draft on bank,	1	0	6	Water Rate to Dublin Corporation,	128	17	10
				Repairs of fountains,	15	13	9
				Grand Jury Rate,	263	11	1
				Over draft at last audit, deducted from judgment,	367	9	1
				In clerk's hands,	9	6	0
					1,437	16	2
					1,437	16	2

RATES ASSessed for the year 1878.

	£	s	d		£	s	d
				Amount collected from 1st January to 31st December, 1878,	1,181	3	9
				Uncollected,	25	2	3
Amount received,	1,916	6	0		1,916	6	0
				LIAbILITY ON TOWNSHIP.			
					£	s	d
Due National Bank, for Special Loss,	500	0	0				
Over draft,	1	0	6				
				Total of Liability,	501	0	6
Court House, Kilmainham,					DAVID M'BENNETT, Chairman.		
15th January, 1879.							

APPENDIX No. 23.—(Page 231.)

NEW KILMAINHAM TOWNSHIP.

Petition of OWNERS OF PROPERTY and RATED OCCUPIERS of the New Kilmainham Township against the Annexation of the Township to the Municipality of the City of Dublin.

To the Municipal Boundary Commissioners appointed by Warrant of His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, dated the 31st day of October, 1878

Sirr,

That your Petitioners are owners of considerable property, ratepayers and occupiers of, and in the new Kilmainham Township, and, as such, strongly object to the annexation of that township to the Municipality of the city of Dublin, as proposed by the Dublin Corporation.

That the effect of such annexation will be to largely increase the burden of taxation upon your petitioners without conferring equivalent advantages upon the township or concurring to the better management of its affairs, either as to administration or execution of works.

That the interests of the township are carefully

looked after and attended to by the Commissioners, both as to the exertion of works, the supply of water and gas, and sanitary and other arrangements.

Your Petitioners consider that the Corporation of Dublin are already heavily burdened with the administration of their own affairs, which it is notoriously known they sadly neglect, and your petitioners believe that if an outlying district, such as this township, be brought within their jurisdiction, the interests of the township would be even still more grievously neglected.

Your Petitioners therefore pray, that upon hearing the evidence to be adduced on behalf of this township, and upon the expression of opinion conveyed by this Petition, you will report against the proposition of the Dublin Corporation to annex the new Kilmainham Township to the Municipality of the city of Dublin.

Signed by DAVID M'BENNETT, esq., A.R., and 128 owners, ratepayers, and occupiers in the township.

APPENDIX No. 24.—(Page 271.)

DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.

RETURNS showing the strength of the Force in each year since 1868, the number of Officers and Constables employed within the city limits for purely Police Purposes; the number employed in the Suburban Metropolitan District outside the city limits; the number employed on Detective duty, and the number employed in Government Offices, and those paid for by Private Individuals, &c., also an account of Receipts from all Local Sources in the same period, from 1868 to 1878, inclusive—

Years.	Total Strength of the Force.										Officers and Men employed within the City Limits for purely Police purposes.						Officers and Men employed in other parts of the Police District outside the City Limits.							
	Separateness			Imports			Acting-Imports			Separateness			Imports			Acting-Imports			Separateness			Imports		
	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Total
1868	7	26	50	79	91	843	1,052	4	19	23	41	42	533	654	13	23	42	226	341	341	341	341	341	
1869	7	26	50	79	93	843	1,062	4	19	24	42	49	541	671	13	23	43	235	351	351	351	351	351	
1870	7	26	50	79	94	843	1,063	4	19	24	42	49	529	670	13	24	40	234	343	343	343	343	343	
1871	7	26	50	79	94	843	1,064	4	19	24	41	49	542	671	13	24	41	236	343	343	343	343	343	
1872	7	26	51	79	93	843	1,064	4	19	24	41	49	542	671	13	24	41	236	343	343	343	343	343	
1873	7	26	51	79	94	845	1,066	4	19	23	43	43	511	672	14	24	41	236	346	346	346	346	346	
1874	7	26	51	79	93	845	1,065	4	19	24	42	49	526	658	13	23	40	236	346	346	346	346	346	
1875	7	26	51	79	92	845	1,065	4	19	23	40	49	523	658	14	24	41	239	346	346	346	346	346	
1876	7	26	51	79	94	845	1,066	4	19	23	40	49	520	660	14	24	40	236	343	343	343	343	343	
1877	7	26	51	79	93	843	1,018	4	17	23	41	45	546	679	14	24	39	223	336	336	336	336	336	
1878	7	26	51	79	94	873	1,122	4	17	23	40	44	548	679	14	24	40	239	346	346	346	346	346	

Years.	Officers and Men employed in all parts of the Police District, principally in the City.										Employed in Government Offices, and those paid for by Private Individuals, &c., &c.						Reportants						
	Reportants			Reportants			Reportants			Reportants			Reportants			Reportants			Reportants			Total	
	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	Reportants	
1868	1	1	13	4	4	19	46	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	17	20	1	1	1	1	1	1	20
1869	1	1	13	4	4	19	46	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	20	26	1	1	1	1	1	1	26
1870	1	1	13	4	4	19	46	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	23	31	1	1	1	1	1	1	31
1871	1	1	13	4	4	19	44	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	23	31	1	1	1	1	1	1	31
1872	1	1	13	4	4	19	44	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	23	31	1	1	1	1	1	1	31
1873	1	1	13	4	4	19	44	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	23	31	1	1	1	1	1	1	31
1874	1	1	13	4	4	19	44	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	23	31	1	1	1	1	1	1	31
1875	1	1	13	4	4	19	44	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	24	32	1	1	1	1	1	1	32
1876	1	1	13	4	4	19	44	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	23	31	1	1	1	1	1	1	31
1877	1	1	13	4	4	19	44	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	23	31	1	1	1	1	1	1	31
1878	1	1	13	4	4	19	44	1	1	1	1	1	4	12	23	31	1	1	1	1	1	1	31

Note.—The yearly average number of men employed in the city for purely police purposes reported on the ten years, 1868-1878, including 11 men, is the only proportion of the total in the detective division, was 10%, towards the support of whom the Police Tax contributed a yearly average of £13,615, or about 2s. per man per year.

The yearly average number employed in the Suburban District outside the city compared on the same ten years, including 11 men as the absolute proportion of the total in the detective division, was 38%, towards whose support the Police Tax contributed a yearly average of £35,751, or 2s. 6d. per man.

Receipts from all Local Sources in the Metropolitan District.

Police Tax—Tenthly Average of the ten years, 1868-78—						
City,	Suburban District,	Reportants	Imports	Acting-Imports	Separateness	Total
						£17,145 18,741 £29,186

Carriage Boxes, &c., and Publishers' Fees in the ten years yearly average. = 6,398

Postage and Publishers' Expenses. = do. 4,897

Fines and Penalties in Police Transactions, &c. = do. 6,177

Unofficial Dues, = do. 2,977

* Government contributions in the Police Tax on Government property excluded.
† It would be difficult to discriminate the proportion under these heads applicable to the city and suburban district respectively.

METROPOLITAN POLICE OFFICE,
DUBLIN CASTLE, 25 May, 1879.

Signed J. H. CONNOLLY,
Commissioner of Police.

DUBLIN METROPOLITAN POLICE.

RETURN of Local Income derived from the City as distinguished, so far as practicable, from the Suburban portion of the Metropolitan District, in the five years, 1874-8.

Year.	Police Tax.	Carriage, Roads and Publicans' Fees.	Fines and Prizes in Police Proceeds etc., Southern and Northern Police Districts.	Prestonshire/ Limerick.	Residential Income.	Total for each year from every source.	Average Annual Income.
						6	
	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.	£ s. d.
1874,	17,803 1 9	4,724 12 0	6,807 17 4	5,478 11 6	In the first year	37,314 3 7	—
1875,	35,118 9 10	4,823 8 0	6,722 5 4	5,883 16 7	the yearly average	37,347 10 9	—
1876,	32,348 12 1	4,675 10 0	6,729 18 5	5,382 17 8	from the city was	37,268 3 8	—
1877,	37,733 9 6	4,731 1 6	7,381 2 11	5,220 12 1	about £3,500.	37,586 6 0	—
1878,	30,021 15 10	4,964 7 6	7,347 5 0	5,138 3 9		36,971 14 6	—
Totals,	91,665 3 0	30,779 5 6	34,963 9 0	25,473 1 0	£12,900	189,327 15 6	35,866

APPENDIX No. 25.—(Page 271.)

RETURN being a continuation of APPENDIX No. 6 to PARLIAMENTARY REPORT "LOCAL GOVERNMENT and TAXATION OF TOWNS (IRELAND)"—No. 282 of 1876.

1876.

Number of Meetings convened,

62

No. 2	Summoned for	0 clock.	No.	Quorum formed at	0 clock.	No.	Summoned for	0 clock.	No.	Quorum formed at	0 clock.
		10	1		1	2		10	1		10
5	—	10 30	1	—	10	2	—	10 45	1	—	10 50
			1	—	10	3	—	11 00	1	—	10 55
			1	—	10	4	—	11 05	1	—	11 00
			1	—	10	5	—	11 10	1	—	11 05
			1	—	10	6	—	11 15	1	—	11 10
			1	—	10	7	—	11 20	1	—	11 15
			1	—	10	8	—	11 25	1	—	11 20
			1	—	10	9	—	11 30	1	—	11 25
			1	—	10	10	—	11 35	1	—	11 30
			1	—	10	11	—	11 40	1	—	11 35
			1	—	10	12	—	11 45	1	—	11 40
			1	—	10	13	—	12 00	1	—	11 45
			1	—	10	14	—	12 05	1	—	12 00
			1	—	10	15	—	12 10	1	—	12 05
			1	—	10	16	—	12 15	1	—	12 10
			1	—	10	17	—	12 20	1	—	12 15
			1	—	10	18	—	12 25	1	—	12 20
			1	—	10	19	—	12 30	1	—	12 25
			1	—	10	20	—	12 35	1	—	12 30
			1	—	10	21	—	12 40	1	—	12 35
			1	—	10	22	—	12 45	1	—	12 40
			1	—	10	23	—	12 50	1	—	12 45
			1	—	10	24	—	12 55	1	—	12 50
			1	—	10	25	—	1 00	1	—	12 55
			1	—	10	26	—	1 05	1	—	1 00
			1	—	10	27	—	1 10	1	—	1 05
			1	—	10	28	—	1 15	1	—	1 10
			1	—	10	29	—	1 20	1	—	1 15
			1	—	10	30	—	1 25	1	—	1 20
			1	—	10	31	—	1 30	1	—	1 25
			1	—	10	32	—	1 35	1	—	1 30
			1	—	10	33	—	1 40	1	—	1 35
			1	—	10	34	—	1 45	1	—	1 40
			1	—	10	35	—	1 50	1	—	1 45
			1	—	10	36	—	1 55	1	—	1 50
			1	—	10	37	—	2 00	1	—	1 55
			1	—	10	38	—	2 05	1	—	2 00
			1	—	10	39	—	2 10	1	—	2 05
			1	—	10	40	—	2 15	1	—	2 10
			1	—	10	41	—	2 20	1	—	2 15
			1	—	10	42	—	2 25	1	—	2 20
			1	—	10	43	—	2 30	1	—	2 25
			1	—	10	44	—	2 35	1	—	2 30
			1	—	10	45	—	2 40	1	—	2 35
			1	—	10	46	—	2 45	1	—	2 40
			1	—	10	47	—	2 50	1	—	2 45
			1	—	10	48	—	2 55	1	—	2 50
			1	—	10	49	—	3 00	1	—	2 55
			1	—	10	50	—	3 05	1	—	3 00
			1	—	10	51	—	3 10	1	—	3 05
			1	—	10	52	—	3 15	1	—	3 10
			1	—	10	53	—	3 20	1	—	3 15
			1	—	10	54	—	3 25	1	—	3 20
			1	—	10	55	—	3 30	1	—	3 25
			1	—	10	56	—	3 35	1	—	3 30
			1	—	10	57	—	3 40	1	—	3 35
			1	—	10	58	—	3 45	1	—	3 40
			1	—	10	59	—	3 50	1	—	3 45
			1	—	10	60	—	3 55	1	—	3 50
			1	—	10	61	—	4 00	1	—	3 55
			1	—	10	62	—	4 05	1	—	4 00
			1	—	10	63	—	4 10	1	—	4 05
			1	—	10	64	—	4 15	1	—	4 10
			1	—	10	65	—	4 20	1	—	4 15
			1	—	10	66	—	4 25	1	—	4 20
			1	—	10	67	—	4 30	1	—	4 25
			1	—	10	68	—	4 35	1	—	4 30
			1	—	10	69	—	4 40	1	—	4 35
			1	—	10	70	—	4 45	1	—	4 40
			1	—	10	71	—	4 50	1	—	4 45
			1	—	10	72	—	4 55	1	—	4 50
			1	—	10	73	—	5 00	1	—	4 55
			1	—	10	74	—	5 05	1	—	5 00
			1	—	10	75	—	5 10	1	—	5 05
			1	—	10	76	—	5 15	1	—	5 10
			1	—	10	77	—	5 20	1	—	5 15
			1	—	10	78	—	5 25	1	—	5 20
			1	—	10	79	—	5 30	1	—	5 25
			1	—	10	80	—	5 35	1	—	5 30
			1	—	10	81	—	5 40	1	—	5 35
			1	—	10	82	—	5 45	1	—	5 40
			1	—	10	83	—	5 50	1	—	5 45
			1	—	10	84	—	5 55	1	—	5 50
			1	—	10	85	—	6 00	1	—	5 55
			1	—	10	86	—	6 05	1	—	6 00
			1	—	10	87	—	6 10	1	—	6 05
			1	—	10	88	—	6 15	1	—	6 10
			1	—	10	89	—	6 20	1	—	6 15
			1	—	10	90	—	6 25	1	—	6 20
			1	—	10	91	—	6 30	1	—	6 25
			1	—	10	92	—	6 35	1	—	6 30
			1	—	10	93	—	6 40	1	—	6 35
			1	—	10	94	—	6 45	1	—	6 40
			1	—	10	95	—	6 50	1	—	6 45
			1	—	10	96	—	6 55	1	—	6 50
			1	—	10	97	—	7 00	1	—	6 55
			1	—	10	98	—	7 05	1	—	7 00
			1	—	10	99	—	7 10	1	—	7 05
			1	—	10	100	—	7 15	1	—	7 10
			1	—	10	101	—	7 20	1	—	7 15
			1	—	10	102	—	7 25	1	—	7 20
			1	—	10	103	—	7 30	1	—	7 25
			1	—	10	104	—	7 35	1	—	7 30
			1	—	10	105	—	7 40	1	—	7 35
			1	—	10	106	—	7 45	1	—	7 40
			1	—	10	107	—	7 50	1	—	7 45
			1	—	10	108	—	7 55	1	—	7 50
			1	—	10	109	—	8 00	1	—	7 55
			1	—	10	110	—	8 05	1	—	8 00
			1	—	10	111	—	8 10	1	—	8 05
			1	—	10	112	—	8 15	1	—	8 10
			1	—	10	113	—	8 20	1	—	8 15
			1	—	10	114	—	8 25	1	—	8 20
			1	—	10	115	—	8 30	1	—	8 25
			1	—	10	116	—	8 35	1	—	8 30
			1	—	10	117	—	8 40	1	—	8 35
			1	—	10	118	—	8 45	1	—	8 40
			1	—	10	119	—	8 50	1	—	8 45
			1	—	10	120	—	8 55	1	—	8 50
			1	—	10	121	—	9 00	1	—	8 55
			1	—	10	122	—	9 05	1	—	9 00
			1	—	10	123	—	9 10	1	—	9 05
			1	—	10	124	—	9 15	1	—	9 10
			1	—	10	125	—	9 20	1	—	9 15
			1	—	10	126	—	9 25	1	—	9 20
			1	—	10	127	—	9 30	1	—	9 25
			1	—	10	128	—	9 35	1	—	9 30

1878.

Number of Meetings convened,

+ 65

No.	Summoned for	O'clock			No.	O'clock			No.	O'clock		
		10	11	No.		10	11	No.		10	11	No.
1	12 45	1			22 50				1			1 30
2	"	12 45	2		22 50				1	15	1	1 25
3	"	12 45	3		22 50				1	30	1	1 45
4	"	12 45	4		22 50				2	0	2	2 15
5	"	12 45	5		22 50				2	15	2	2 30
6	"	12 45	6		22 50				2	30	2	2 45
7	"	12 45	7		22 50				3	0	3	3 15
8	"	12 45	8		22 50				3	15	3	3 30
9	"	12 45	9		22 50				3	30	3	3 45
10	"	12 45	10		22 50				4	0	4	4 15
11	"	12 45	11		22 50				4	15	4	4 30
12	"	12 45	12		22 50				4	30	4	4 45
13	"	12 45	13		22 50				5	0	5	5 15
14	"	12 45	14		22 50				5	15	5	5 30
15	"	12 45	15		22 50				5	30	5	5 45
16	"	12 45	16		22 50				6	0	6	6 15
17	"	12 45	17		22 50				6	15	6	6 30
18	"	12 45	18		22 50				6	30	6	6 45
19	"	12 45	19		22 50				7	0	7	7 15
20	"	12 45	20		22 50				7	15	7	7 30
21	"	12 45	21		22 50				7	30	7	7 45
22	"	12 45	22		22 50				8	0	8	8 15
23	"	12 45	23		22 50				8	15	8	8 30
24	"	12 45	24		22 50				8	30	8	8 45
25	"	12 45	25		22 50				9	0	9	9 15
26	"	12 45	26		22 50				9	15	9	9 30
27	"	12 45	27		22 50				9	30	9	9 45
28	"	12 45	28		22 50				10	0	10	10 15
29	"	12 45	29		22 50				10	15	10	10 30
30	"	12 45	30		22 50				10	30	10	10 45
31	"	12 45	31		22 50				11	0	11	11 15
32	"	12 45	32		22 50				11	15	11	11 30
33	"	12 45	33		22 50				11	30	11	11 45

There were two counts set in the year during transaction of business.

Special meeting summoned for the 15th February, 1878, to petition Government to release the political prisoners, commenced at 1 o'clock, quorum at 1 15.

Special meeting summoned for 1st March, 1878, at 2 o'clock, vote of congratulation on the accession of Pope Leo XIII, quorum at 3 15 o'clock.

Special meeting summoned for the 2d June, 1878, to adopt petitions to the House of Commons relative to the Irish University Bill, commenced at 2 45 o'clock, quorum at 1 o'clock.

Election of Town Clerk 5th September, 1878, commenced for 2 o'clock, quorum at 2 15 o'clock.

Election of Assistant to the Town Clerk 22d September, 1878, commenced for 1 o'clock, quorum at 1 15 o'clock.

Election of Secretary to the Pewsey, &c., Committee 23d September, 1878, commenced for 1 o'clock, quorum at 1 15 o'clock.

Election of Secretary, Finance and Audit Committee, 2d December, 1878, commenced for 1 o'clock, quorum at 1 15 o'clock.

On the 20th January, 1878, the following standing order was adopted:—(P. 17) "That in future the roll be called at a quarter past one o'clock."

APPENDIX 26.—(Page 272.)

RETURN showing TOTAL RECEIPTS and TOTAL PAYMENTS during the six years ended 31st AUGUST, 1877, as per ABSTRACTS of the LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD AUDITORS.

		Receipts			Payments			Balances of Receipts or Payments			Excess of Payments over Receipts.		
		£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
1872.	Total,	127,305	12	3	235,652	7	4	1,703	5	11	—	—	—
1873.	Do.,	218,334	10	0	220,049	6	1	—	—	—	2,125	15	8
1874.	Do.,	215,164	5	1	204,997	5	1	8,167	0	0	—	—	—
1875.	Do.,	220,817	0	5	250,206	6	0	95,860	18	10	—	—	—
1876.	Do.,	233,487	12	9	283,537	12	1	—	—	—	15,940	14	8
1877.	Do.,	—	—	—	240,629	7	11	—	—	—	18,181	15	2
					1,424,143	8	3	—	—	—	33,218	5	6
	Balance, being excess of Receipts over payments,	—	—	—	6,462	19	3	—	—	—	6,562	19	8
					38,761	4	9	—	—	—	39,761	4	9
					1,430,086	7	6						

	Amount of Loans made for Local Govt.			Amount of Loans repaid and Bonds released included in Payments.										
	Water Works	Improvement Fund	Local Govt.	Water Works Loans	Water Works Bonds, £s.	Improvement Fund Bonds								
1872.	Total,	1,003	6	2	3,004	10	3	4,001	0	0	1,200	0	0	
1873.	"	7,000	0	0	—	12,329	18	4	2,000	0	0	1,200	0	0
1874.	"	2,000	0	0	—	6,638	17	3	2,377	0	0	200	0	0
1875.	"	44,900	0	0	—	14,110	18	2	—	—	—	300	0	0
1876.	"	7,000	0	0	20,000	0	0	12,377	3	0	200	0	0	
1877.	"	6,500	0	0	—	12,670	19	11	—	—	—	1,200	0	0
		106,403	0	0	21,043	6	2	67,622	4	10	4,200	0	0	
					31,622	11	1	4,200	0	0	625	0	0	

June, 1879.

THOMAS O'DONNELL, City Accountant.

APPENDIX No. 27.—(Page 273.)

CORPORATION OF DUBLIN.

TOTAL RENTS ACCRUED and RECEIVED upon the RENTAL of the CRRR ESTATES from the year 1842 to 1859, and from 1859 to 1878, showing the good collection.

1842 to 1859, accrued,	£253,600	Received,	£266,768
1860 to 1878, do.,	332,145	do.,	—	337,633
					£3,697,621

July 2, 1879.

JOHN CURTIN, City Treasurer.

APPENDIX No. 28.—(Page 273.)

THE DUBLIN CORPORATION FINANCIALLY SOUND.

Total debts due by the Corporation of Dublin at 31st August, 1878,	£205,804
In 1891 the interest from City Estates, &c. (no part of which will include taxes), will amount to £30,000 per annum. If then sold, at say twenty-five years' purchase, the sale would realise,	660,000

And would reduce the whole indebtedness within three years from 1879, to the small sum of

205,804

NOTE.—The rates could therefore be reduced by the amount of interest at present paid on the debt in the difference between £205,804 and £30,000.

July 3, 1879.

JOHN CURTIN, City Treasurer.

APPENDIX No. 29.—(Page 286.)

—	Post Rate for Kingstown Electoral Division.	Post Rate for Suburban Electoral Divn 1868	Township Rate for Kingstown.	County of Large Contributions.
1874	d	d	s d	s s d
1875	18 in £	10 in £	2 9 in £	1,790 9 10
1875	12 "	11 "	2 11 "	1,870 10 11
1876	11 "	9 "	2 11 "	1,329 19 1
1877	10 "	9 "	2 1 "	1,373 17 9
1878	14 "	12 "	3 3 "	1,714 14 10
1879	16 "	13 "	3 0 "	1,515 16 6

* In Blackrock Ward, Rs. 1d. in £.

Number of Ratings in each Ward, and the respective Areas, Valuations, &c.

—	No. of Ratings.	Area.	Valuation	Qualified Voters.	Qualified to act as Commissioners
Glasnevin, E.,	565	A. B. T.	L. s. d.		
Kingstown E.,	211	603 2 22	16,628 0 0	377	183
Kingstown W.,	1,393	230 1 25	21,823 15 0	363	234
Monkstown, -	216	337 1 27	20,680 0 0	494	295
		215 3 33	12,880 5 0	132	100
	3,207	1,467 1 33	72,322 0 0	1,355	732

Total Area of Kingstown, 1,467 A. 1R. 38P.; Population in 1871, 17,528 (estimated now at 21,000).

—	£	s	d
Valuation, —	72,072	0	0
Gas Males,	...	0	0
Water Males,	...	0	0
Government Property,	543	0	0
Total, —	72,619	0	0

Kingstown, September 16, 1879.

R. J. EXSIS, Secretary.

APPENDIX No. 30.—(Page 286.)

Copy of a resolution unanimously passed at a meeting of the Commissioners of Dalkey Township, held on 1st September, 1879.

Moved by Mr. JOHN FLAXMAN, seconded by Mr. ROBERT T. CALLOW, and resolved,—

"That this Board would not entertain even the idea of amalgamation with Kingstown Township, and that the following Commissioners be asked to attend the enquiry at Blackrock to-morrow and resist any attempt of amalgamation."

"A. O'NEILL, s.p., Chairman, H. Parkinson, s.p., C. Higginbotham, R. T. Calow, M. Casey, and J. Flaxman, and the Town Clerk."

HUGH O'NEILL, Town Clerk.